CRITICAL NOTES ON OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY

THE TRADITIONS OF SAUL AND DAVID

BY

STANLEY A. COOK, M.A.
FELLOW AND LECTURER IN HEBREW AND SYRIAC
GONVILLE AND CAIUS COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE
MEMBER OF THE EDITORIAL STAFF OF
THE 'ENCYCLOPAEDIA BIBLICA'

London
MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1907

OXFORD: HORACE HART
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

CONTENTS.

PAGE

INTRODUCTION v

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS xvii

SECTION I. THE LIFE OF DAVID 1

Criticism of 2 Sam. ix-xx—its bearing upon traditions of David's earlier days—David and Bethlehem, Levites and Kadesh—historical difficulties in 2 Samuel—criticism of David's reign.

SECTION II. SAUL 19

General views of his character—his defeat of the Philistines—criticism of 1 Sam. xiii sq.—the prelude to the Philistine oppression—relation to Judges x. 6-xii. 7—features in traditions of Saul—subordination to those of David—Saul in Benjamin, David in Bethlehem—quality and quantity of literary material.

SECTION III. JUDGES x. 6—1 SAM. VIII 33

Interrelation and general character of the contents—narratives of Samuel—Eli and the ark—problems of Shiloh and the ark—relations between ark and southern clans—Danite migration—Benjamin and non-Israelite districts—rise of the Philistines.

SECTION IV. SAUL AND BENJAMIN 46

Development of historical material—the evidence for Benjamite origin of Saul—for relations between Samuel and Saul—trend of Benjamite tradition—points of contact between traditions of Saul, Joshua, and the patriarchs—Saul originally not Benjamite—general considerations for history of Saul and David.

SECTION V. MERIBATH-KADESH 62

Traditions of the Exodus—narratives in Exod. xv. 22-xviii, and in Num. x. 29-xxi—their interrelation—early prominence of Kadesh—its traditions of selection and rejection—journey from Kadesh northwards—fusion of divergent views.

PAGE

SECTION VI. THE CALEBITE TRADITION 84

Relation between Kadesh-traditions and southern clans—Moses and Caleb—Korah and Levites—Reuben, Simeon, and Dan—contact with Davidic traditions—genealogy of "Hezron"—other traditions of southern origin—fusion with "Israelite" traditions—historicity of divergent traditions—bearing of southern group upon Judaean history.

SECTION VII. LITERARY AND HISTORICAL CRITICISM . . 101

Origin of "Israel"—historicity of tradition—free use of older material—methods of compilers—methods of historical criticism—value of literary criticism—growth, dates, and relative age of traditions—post-Deuteronomic insertions—bearing upon history—history and its bearing upon literary criticism.

SECTION VIII. SAUL AND DAVID 122

Kadesh traditions independent of "Israelite"—lack of continuity between old narratives of Joshua, the "Judges," and Saul—oldest traditions of Saul independent of those of David—difficulties involved in the fusion—David's capture of Jerusalem—connexion with Kadesh and Caleb group—absence of continuity in traditions of David and Solomon—bearing upon later history.

SECTION IX. CONCLUSION 142

Israelite traditions of Saul—twofold view of origin of "Israel"—Saul and northern origin, David and southern group—fusion in Judges i and patriarchal narratives—obscure character of southern group—possible connexion with history of Levites—bearing upon history of monarchy—traditions of Palestine (Israel) fused with southern group and taken over by Judah.

SELECT INDEX OF BIBLICAL PASSAGES 155

GENERAL INDEX 158

INTRODUCTION.

The publication of the present studies is due to the liberal-minded editors of the Jewish Quarterly Review in whose hospitable pages, always open to biblical research, they first appeared. They began with the attempt to make an independent investigation of early Hebrew history to the time of David, and, taking their rise in an examination of a number of detailed points some years ago when the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* was in course of preparation, form the continuation of the preliminary article on the Composition of 2 Samuel, published in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, April, 1900.

After a discussion of certain historical questions in 2 Samuel (section i, *J. Q. R.*, July, 1905), I have dealt independently with Saul and the narratives which lead up to his rise. The evidence appeared to show that many of the older narratives which have gathered around the first king of Israel were not trustworthy, and that in their present form they are the result of certain processes of redaction, the character and relative age of which can usually be determined (sections ii–iv, *J. Q. R.*, October, 1905, January, April, 1906). The oldest of the traditions had points of contact with the old stories of Joshua and with certain features in the patriarchal narratives. Next, although several writers have recognized the importance of Kadesh in early traditions, and admit the possibility of a distinct movement into Judah, an independent study seemed to show that the traditions in question belonged to a specific group which pointed to a movement into both Israel and Judah (sections v–vi, *J. Q. R.*, July, October, 1906). By this time the stage was reached where the reconciliation of the evidence with modern critical views of early Israelite history became impossible. It seemed probable that there were two main groups of traditions pointing to a twofold view of the origin of Israel, and that these were inextricably bound up with the

entire course of biblical history. Consequently, in the concluding instalment (sections vii–ix, January, 1907), after dealing very briefly with general principles and methods of criticism, I summarized the evidence for the period under review, and contented myself with indicating rather than discussing the deeper questions which were unavoidably raised.

The irresistible conclusion regarding the traditions of Saul and David (p. 140) strikes at the root of modern historical criticism. Although the rise of the Hebrew kingdom at their age is entirely justified by the inactivity of the surrounding powers, and although writers may have had access to some traditions of the period (e.g. conflicts with Philistines), the conclusion seemed inevitable that no consecutive history was preserved. It was impossible to avoid the feeling that one was dealing with narratives whose historical background had to be sought in later periods, when there were historical situations upon which our present records are unaccountably scanty. It may suffice to refer merely to Israel's great conflicts with Damascus in Jehu's dynasty, or to Judah's varying relations with the Philistine cities in the latter half of the eighth century (see p. 151, n. 1). Since literary criticism has recognized that the sources for the earlier periods originated at various later ages when other periods of history were being handled, a more synthetic treatment seemed ultimately indispensable.

That the attempt to investigate afresh the traditions of early Hebrew history should have compelled a reconsideration of the prevailing historical theories is not wholly surprising when one observes the trend of recent criticism elsewhere. Baentsch's plea in his *Monotheismus* (Tübingen, 1906) is an indication of the growing feeling that the theory of the development of Israel is unsatisfactory. Winckler, too, has frequently expressed himself strongly to the same effect. Both have the strongest claims to a hearing, but neither appear to allow sufficiently for the character of the biblical records.

There are three aspects of biblical study which cannot long be disassociated from each other. In the first place, the vast additions to our knowledge from excavation and the monuments have compelled a modification of traditional views, and

have presented a picture of intercourse, life, and thought in ancient Palestine which cannot fail to make a profound impression upon biblical study. Winckler himself has boldly emphasized the fact that Israelite history cannot be studied without taking into consideration the known social and political influence of the surrounding great powers. If a more comprehensive representation of the Hebrews in the ancient Oriental world suffers from an insufficient attention to the minutiae of criticism, the result is at least more stimulating than the frequent conception of Israelite history which ignores or fails to realize the land in which this history unfolded itself.

In the second place, the work that has been done in the comparative sociology and religion of the Semites has, in its turn, removed the Israelites from the isolated position in which their own records appeared to place them. From the general fundamental features, and from a study of the diverging observances among the Semites, the specific characteristics of any particular subdivision—in our case, the Hebrews—can be more safely calculated. Whatever historical theories may be adopted, this general identity of the features of Hebrew custom and religion with those of other Semitic races cannot be neglected[1]. If it is possible to understand ancient life and thought by the application of the comparative method, it would be precarious to assume too hastily that the growth of Israelite religious ideas moved hand-in-hand with a sociological development. Theories based upon the growth of prophets' ideals may not do justice to the evidence for popular religious thought and practice in Israel itself, in pre- or post-Israelite Palestine, or even to the weight of external evidence generally.

But, lastly, it is impossible to ignore the demands of strict literary and historical criticism. The compilatory character of the Old Testament being undeniable, the conclusion that the traditions are preserved in two main recensions, the Deuteronomic and the Priestly, corresponding to a two-fold development in the religious history, has been found during the last thirty years to be an adequate explanation of the

[1] Although I use the terms Semites and Semitic for convenience, it is naturally recognized that they are, speaking strictly, too restrictive.

present sources[1]. It is significant that even the sturdiest opponents to constructive literary criticism virtually acknowledge that the Old Testament is a compilation, and find themselves compelled to employ a kind of criticism of their own, which, however, does not proceed beyond the most elementary stages. But when it is granted that literary criticism is the preliminary essential to biblical study, and when one expresses one's sincerest appreciation of the laborious investigations of individual critics, the fact remains that the application of literary-critical results to historical research entails a more comprehensive—a more historical treatment of the entire evidence.

Consequently there are many considerations usual in historical research which will doubtless receive more attention in the future. The recognition that the writers of the Old Testament were the children of their age will point to the necessity of scrutinizing more closely the different subjective elements. A more comprehensive survey of those sources related in content or style may be more profitable than the minute investigation of specific books or sections which are

[1] The conclusion, stated as above, by enabling one to work back from the known (the present sources) to the unknown, prevents some initial errors, and avoids reliance upon the more uncertain literary theories. Consequently, whatever be the true dates of the older narratives, the starting-point is the recognition that they are now preserved by a D or P. (It seems impossible to be conclusive in regard to the Deut. redaction, or redactions, but one cannot resist the belief that there is much material of post-Deut. *insertion* which had not previously found a place in the sources employed by D.) For example, literary criticism may show that the patriarchal narratives are older stories preserved by P, but the problem of the dates of the "pre-priestly" material must depend upon criteria which are quite free from any ambiguity. The revived tendency (Gunkel, Winckler, A. Jeremias) seems to favour traditional views, but is supported by fallacious arguments (cp. Driver's criticisms, *Genesis*, *Add.*, p. xxxi sq.), and when writers point to the conformity of the details with known oriental culture and custom of the age to which the narratives are attributed, it is sufficient to observe that the evidence of A. Jeremias himself would show that similar features are found in late biblical writings, in apocryphal books, and even in the Talmud. A recent opponent to criticism contends against the usually accepted views of the date (ninth to eighth century), and if his arguments are sound, there may be independent grounds for a date much nearer to P. (See below, p. xiv, n., and p. 147 sq.)

already known to be the result of a continued literary process. The general character of the more detailed narratives will invite attention; the recognition of local stories will suggest inquiry into the reason and period of their incorporation (p. 149 sq.). So, also, the wider grasp of the nature of history and history-writing will forbid the premature attempt to force external evidence into agreement with biblical records and the reverse, and if one considers the many momentous events upon which our sources are almost or quite silent, these features in turn will deserve their share of consideration.

It is evident that Old Testament history often introduces us to quiet semi-secluded circles, whose horizon was not that of the court-prophet or royal scribe. We find a real and lively interest in the work of prophetical figures, and where we can recognize specific factors in the growth and redaction of literary material, it is time to consider what other causes may have operated. Again, the popular traditions of the people would not necessarily be those of the priest, but it is to them that we look for a picture of normal Israelite life, and the fact that popular lore continues outside the Old Testament in varying forms is helpful for an estimate of the earlier features[1].

Thus, the mutual independence of literary and historical criticism shows itself constantly. Perhaps literary critics have hitherto been too much under the influence of literary theories; for historical criticism every gloss and every (apparently) "unhistorical" notice is of extreme importance (p. 129, n. 3; p. 131, n. 2). When once it is recognized that the compilers held historical views of Israelite legal institutions which are not trustworthy, unprejudiced criticism cannot shrink from scrutinizing theories which affect the trend of Israelite history itself. Where the literary sources are scanty, the historical imagination will be more keenly kindled. If the Judaean compiler practically ignores Israel after the fall of Samaria, modern research cannot follow in his steps. The continuance of the old popular religion, the possible (although surely

[1] If the author of the Book of Jubilees found it necessary to inculcate his teaching by a revised form of the patriarchal history, one may gain some hint regarding earlier methods of teaching and instruction.

probable) survival of the influence of early prophets, the fact that some kind of Yahweh worship was recognized two centuries later—such points as these invite a reconstruction of the period. Literary criticism may find in later Ephraimite writings an approximation to Deuteronomic thought, and inscriptions of Sargon (p. 120), with their evidence for new colonists, will remind us that the desert tribes were deficient neither in culture nor religion. One will hesitate to draw too sharp a line between Judah and Israel in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C.;—even in Judah itself the fall of the monarchy meant the revival of popular religion and older custom. It may be that the influence of Manasseh had modified both, but it cannot be denied that men like Micah —not to mention others—had stood entirely isolated. Josiah's reforms, admitted to have been practically a failure, may have sprung from or may have given birth to a Deuteronomy, but with the rebuilding of the Temple the opportunity was once more at hand for putting its teaching into practice. It is an age which is slowly being illuminated[1]. But there comes a time when Judah, whom tradition has enrolled among the *sons* of Israel, but who once had been the rival of the northern kingdom, now claims to be the true Israel, and the breach with Samaria is complete. Traces of these definite changes in political attitude are to be sought for in the written traditions and may probably be recognized, and the growing mass of "exilic" and "post-exilic" literature must ultimately cast light upon the inner history of these changes and will also illuminate the obscurity of the earliest period of Israel.

The problem of early Israelite history still remains—some new perspective, some reconstruction of the history is rendered compulsory, not merely by internal literary criticism, but by the progress of archaeological and scientific research. Nevertheless, the present development theory does not appear to do

[1] Cp. most recently R. H. Kennett, *Journal of Theological Studies*, Jan., 1905, July, 1906. The mechanical view that with the fall of Samaria thought and literature were driven into Judah (cp. e.g. J. P. Peter's *Early Heb. History*, p. 19; Budde, *Gesch. d. alt-heb. Lit.*, p. 99) can surely attract no one who has attempted to understand the internal history of the sixth or fifth centuries B.C.

adequate justice to all the available evidence. The reconstructions of the last thirty years cannot of course be defined in a paragraph. But they work forward instead of adopting the attitude of compilers and viewing history retrospectively; relatively old material is often ignored; under the influence of the quantity of the material, criticism and the treatment of the history is uneven; the close attention devoted to the history of the Exodus and the Invasion is often less conspicuous in the old portions of Samuel and Kings. Critics admit that not all the Israelites were in Egypt, or that not all the tribes invaded Palestine together. The steady growth of the traditions is recognized, but the older sources are supplemented by isolated narratives of unique character (p. 148, n. 2). Thus, they find a gradual settlement in Palestine, a change from nomad to settled life, and a recrudescence of Israelite religion after a time when Yahweh and Baal were practically indistinguishable, and when Israel and Canaan were virtually one.

Baentsch, impressed with the evidence for highly developed forms of religion in the old Semitic world, has sketched a compromise, which, however, is scarcely adequate from an historical point of view. Nevertheless, he is at least justified by the fact that the Old Testament traditions indicate that the ancestors of the Israelites had indeed worshipped Yahweh in the past, but without knowing his name[1]. Whatever be the evidence for a Yahweh outside Israel, the "name," the new manifestation is the Mosaic revelation, and, on the lines of Budde, must be connected with the Mosaic clans. But whilst the traditions of the ancestors usually appear to be underestimated, those of the Mosaic clans are worked into Hebrew history in a manner which is unsatisfying.

The result of the present series of studies has been to recover two main groups of tradition, one of which links together the entrance of the ancestors and the older accounts of Joshua and Saul, while the other pointed to a movement from the south into Judah and Israel. The latter could not possibly be reconciled with the ordinary views of the "Israelite" invasion, and contained a number of perplexing features

[1] Cp. Budde, *Religion of Israel to the Exile*, p. 14 sq.

which could only be discussed when later periods of the history had been handled; they appeared to be due partly to the specific traditions of that caste known as the Levites, partly to Judaean and Davidic traditions, and partly to some fusion, apparently with the former group. Now, although the conclusions are obviously incomplete, a number of indications suggest that some light may be thrown upon them from the literary and historical criticism of Kings. Here a Judaean compiler has used a history of Israel (the northern kingdom) which evidently consisted of, or was based upon, annals, fuller political records, and narratives illustrating the prominence of prophets in political and private life. This collection had an independent position, it was written from the Israelite standpoint, and may fairly be regarded as part of the specific national literature of the northern kingdom. But to the man of Israel, his history began before Jeroboam I, before David and Solomon, and when we find in 1 and 2 Samuel material characteristic of the annals (pp. 133, 142, n. 1), need we doubt that it looked back to Saul and his rise? Next, this collection includes stories of the prophets (Elijah and Elisha), some of which are of such purely private interest that one might be tempted to infer that the whole had passed through the hands of a circle to whom the work of the prophets was of paramount importance. Thence, one will not unnaturally be led to ask whether the spirit which we recognize in the narratives of Elijah and Elisha may not also be discovered in the stories of Samuel and Saul; several points of contact already seem apparent (pp. 29, 35). Finally, if it should seem probable that there was an extensive *Israelite* work which was not limited to the Book of Kings, literary and historical criticism will also have to take into account the circumstance that material similar to the *Judaean* annals in Kings is likewise found in 2 Samuel (pp. 133, 139, n. 1).

But the historical traditions of Judah, like those of the movement from the south, present several noteworthy features. In Kings, apart from annals and temple-records the political matter is relatively slight. It would be rash to found any conclusion upon one fact, but it is at least remarkable that a compiler must needs narrate the defeat of Amaziah from

an Israelite source. The internal character and historical value of the more detailed narratives will require independent study apart from provisional conclusions already independently reached in regard to Judaean history in 1 and 2 Samuel (pp. 138, 150). Certainly, if David was the popular hero of the common people, as Robertson Smith has remarked in his study of Micah[1], it is precisely the incorporation of popular narratives which attract notice, whether they are based upon historical incidents at Gath and elsewhere, or move in the Jebusite district between Bethlehem and Gibeah, and give a less trustworthy representation of the first king of the rival kingdom. All the problems which Judaean history raises from first to last are materially connected with the discussion of the movement from the south which now underlies the account of the Exodus (pp. 58 sq., 100, n. 1), and, again, literary criticism and the historical criticism must go hand in hand. Cheyne has observed that "the exile was a literary as well as a political catastrophe, and the fragments of the early literature had to be pieced together or even re-cast by the literary skill of editors[2]." Although his words refer to the pre-exilic prophetic writings they may prove to have a wider application. It will be perceived that again the problem of the internal character of traditions comes to the fore, and the fact that the northern people had doubtless recovered from the fall of Samaria by the time that Judah suffered its catastrophe may furnish a clue.

Now, there are those who would find a Yahweh outside Palestine or before the age of Moses. They may or may not be justified, but obviously the popular current Yahweh-worship cannot be gauged entirely from the denunciations of those who were in advance of their age. The biblical evidence would suggest that the popular indigenous religion had been Yahwism, and that, although the ancestors worshipped Yahweh, a new conception came in under the influence of a movement which is traditionally associated with the south of Palestine. The national traditions of the northern kingdom are those of a greater Israel (p. 151, n. 2), and they suggest that the Israelites had lived in Palestine before our *historical* records

[1] *Prophets of Israel*, p. 292.

[2] Introduction to *Prophets of Israel*, p. xiii.

begin, and that it was through those who participated in the new movement that the alternative view of Israel's origin took shape. There are many factors which have helped to build up the present account of the Exodus—the history of the religious birth of the people (p. 123 sq.), and if the new Yahweh had come from the desert, that inherent solidarity between the god and all his worshippers would surely influence the belief that they too had come from the same quarter.

If we are to look upon Palestine as already inhabited by its Israelites, the historical background for the new movement can perhaps be found in the middle of the ninth century. With the accession of Jehu we encounter—to use Budde's words—"the primitive worshippers of Yahweh, the Kenite Rechabites," men who were "conscious of being the proper, the genuine, the original worshippers of Yahweh." Now these fierce zealots irresistibly remind us of the wild Danites, the founders of the northern sanctuary (cp. p. 88), of Levi and Simeon and their dealings with Shechem, and even of the Levites themselves who gained their blessing by their uncompromising adherence to Yahweh. A related tradition appears to run through the series—even Elijah himself, did he not receive the promise at Horeb that the mission of the sword was at hand?[1] The brief remarks below on p. 152 (note 2 with references) may prove

[1] That these traditions are related seems clear from the evidence for the Levitical families. Subsequently judgment is passed upon the bloodshed of Jehu (Hos. i. 4), and many have been the discussions concerning the changed standpoint (cp. Harper, *Amos and Hosea*, p. xlvii sq.). But again the traditions agree. How came it that tradition could ever ascribe an offence to the great leaders Moses and Aaron, an offence, too, which reflects upon their attitude to Yahweh? The "brothers" Simeon and Levi are solemnly cursed for their fierce violence, and the priesthood of Shiloh, of famous ancestry, is condemned for its iniquity. If Shiloh fell with Dan in the deportation of the land, it is singular that the Kenites (? of the north, Judg. iv. 11) are threatened with captivity by Asshur (Num. xxiv. 22). Further, if Cain is an eponym of the Kenites, it is noteworthy that the story preserved in P's recension, amid a great variety of motives, condemns the nomad for the murder of the agriculturist, but curiously protects him from vengeance. The change in attitude becomes more distinctively Judaean when Eli's house is threatened (1 Sam. ii. 27–36), when Abiathar is replaced by Zadok, and when the Jerusalem priests (one may compare here the names of Melchi-*zedek*, and even Adoni-*zedek*) gain the supremacy over the other Levites.

that a critical examination of the period of Jehu is necessary, and it may not be considered rash to handle it ultimately in connexion with the allied traditions to which some allusion has been made.

The successive recovery of older traditions does not necessarily furnish the older (and true) sequence of the past. The whole extent of biblical history is so intimately bound together as the result of the two leading recensions that the entire period requires the most careful examination from beginning to end. The concluding centuries bring their own problem of the relations between north and south, and this is closely connected with the earliest period, that of the tribes (which past criticism has proved to stand in need of some reconstruction), with the events leading up to the Divided Monarchy (the subject of these notes), and with the few years which precede the accession of Jehu. Consequently, although it appeared that sufficient evidence had been handled to justify the chief conclusions, the danger of pursuing the enquiry within too narrow limits became ever more clearly realized as these notes took their present shape. It was an inevitable step from the attempt to recover the original history to the final recognition that the first task is the study of the historical views of the compilers and the classification of the pre-priestly or pre-Deuteronomic traditions, and this, combined with the necessity of taking account of other lines of investigation, will demonstrate that the time has not yet come for the more connected narrative which a friendly writer in the *Biblical World* hoped to see published in the near future.

Finally, it is known that there must have been some compromise: P's honourable treatment of the non-Aaronites, and the extension of the priesthood to families of Abiathar, represent another standpoint which cannot be disassociated from the obscuring of the offence of Moses and Aaron, the attempt to justify the deeds of Levi and Simeon, and the later growing tendency to ignore Jacob's curse and to extol the pious duty of the two "brothers." Here as elsewhere (p. 148 sq.) there are strange vicissitudes which must necessarily have some explanation in the history; but the one period where light is to be sought is precisely that upon which the records are almost silent. Too little is known of the relations between Zerubbabel and the son of Jehozadak, yet it is not too much to say that in the history of the Second Temple lies the key to half the problems of the Old Testament.

The work of testing details must necessarily be undertaken before one can estimate fairly the history as a whole, and the result to be at all adequate must view everything in due proportion. Elaborate literary theories must depend upon the recovery of a secure historical outline, and textual criticism which affects the details of history will be the outcome rather than the starting-point. The work which has been done by Winckler and A. Jeremias cannot be ignored, particularly in considering the *dress* in which the traditions have been clothed, but I must confess that I cannot view their evidence as a practical guide for the preliminary steps. The minute studies by Ed. Meyer and Luther (*Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*) have proved helpful in many respects, although the fact that so little attention is paid to the crucial period of biblical history (viz. the monarchy) must detract from the value of minute investigation of material of contemporary (or later) origin. I must freely acknowledge my indebtedness to the commentaries on the books of Samuel by H. P. Smith, Budde, and the concise though not superficial work by A. R. S. Kennedy. In all biblical research one is always profoundly indebted to those scholars whose labours alone have made further progress possible, and if I owe most to those from whom I have perhaps differed most (and who will perhaps differ most from me), it is because the insight of one, the methods of another, and the minuteness of a third have been more stimulating than any one particular plan of research. It must, however, be acknowledged that the greatest indebtedness has been to those whose studies were conducted in fields often far removed in place and time from the Palestine of the Ancient Hebrews. In the endeavour to avoid specific faulty methods, it is uncommonly easy to be guilty of others, and, recognizing this, I can only hope that mine will not too seriously prejudice this preliminary attempt to build another superstructure upon the foundation which the founders of modern biblical research have firmly laid. For all criticisms, whether public or private, I shall always be sincerely grateful.

STANLEY A. COOK.

CAMBRIDGE,
June, 1907.

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

Page 2, line 1. "Five years." The words were written in 1905.

ibid., note 2. The references to the page alone are confined to the first section.

P. 4, l. 2. *Read* ii–iv.

P. 6, l. 9, and 8 foot. On the structure of Samuel see also pp. 116, n. 1 (end), 130, n. 1, 139, n. 1 (end). The problem is that of the development of the views of the early history of Israel, and any complete hypothesis must be based upon the results of historical criticism. The questions are closely bound up with the structure of Judges and of Kings. In regard to the latter, the view that the separate annals of Judah and of Israel can be traced in Samuel seems indispensable. In regard to the former it would appear that the three distinct stages (pre-Deuteronomic, Deut., and post-Deut.), suggest a clue. See below on p. 25.

P. 9, l. 9 from end. *For* "who" *read* "whom."

P. 20, ll. 14, 15. *Read* "present" *and* "imply."

P. 21, n. 1. *Read* חרדו.

P. 22, n. 2. See, however, p. 112, n. 5.

P. 23, n. 1. See p. 111, n. 1, and note below on p. 25.

P. 24, l. 29. *Read* "stories."

P. 25, ll. 8–10. The intricacy of the problems is well illustrated in the relation between 1 Sam. vii and Saul's two victories: over the Ammonites and over the Philistines. The latter forces one to conclude that chap. vii is "unhistorical," but can one decide what is and what is not "historical" for the period in question? I suggested that the compiler who used chap. vii associated Saul's rise with the Ammonite campaign (p. 142). In fact, the representation in vii–viii is admitted to be followed by x. 17–27, where Saul is selected, but has yet to prove his worth. A month later (see p. 23, l. 5) the opportunity actually came, and he stirred Israel to the rescue of Jabesh-Gilead. The deed convinced even his enemies. and Saul's election was "renewed" (xi. 12–15). All is superficially consistent. This later, more complete and predominating view, shows us Samuel the last of the Israelite "judges," with his sons at Beersheba (viii. 2); the tribes of all Israel are collected (x. 17 sqq.), Saul sends round to all the borders of Israel, and the inclusion of men of Judah among his army (xi. 8) is quite in accordance with the general trend of *one*

tradition of the change from the "judges" to the monarchy. It is one historical theory and must be judged as a whole. It is clear that the compiler has used or rewritten in chap. xi a record which is scarcely in its original form, and criticism reveals the numerous inconcinnities which can be found even in this more or less complete thread of narratives. But when this has been said, historical criticism is faced with the fact that chap. xi cannot by any reasonable means be brought into line with Saul's victory over the Philistines, where he is raised up to free the people from an enemy who have occupied central Palestine and have even driven some of its inhabitants across the Jordan to Gad and Gilead (xiii. 7, cp. xiv. 21, 22). The narratives in vii, viii, x. 17–27, xi occupy an intermediate position between later tendencies inimical to Saul and earlier stages where there are unmistakable points of contact between Saul's exploits and events in Judges x sqq. If one is justified in the belief that some traditions represent Saul as a figure analogous to a Jacob or Joshua (p. 146), others as the last "judge" and first king of Israel, and yet others closed the pre-monarchical period with Samuel, the attempt to find a continuous history may well be hopeless. The scantiness of the material may preclude confident solutions of the problems, and it is not inconceivable that legends of the heroic age have been historicized, and that Hebrew history—like that of ancient Rome—first appears upon the scene as an adult organism.

P. 27, l. 22. *Read* "is."

P. 30, n. 1. *Read* "p. 6 sq."

Pp. 31, 41. David as the original Joshua of the south—but see p. 147, n. 2.

P. 42, l. 23. The suggestion that the ark was exclusively Judaean—or Calebite—is made from too narrow a standpoint. It is evident that there were divergent traditions of the ark which cannot be reconciled (pp. 89, n. 3, 90), and the attempt has been made to separate the Judaean forms (pp. 124, 134). But the varied traditions now come ultimately from Judaean hands, although at an earlier stage the southern traditions have been fused with those which are more distinctively Israelite. Judah, in addition to its claims to the title and religious heritage of Israel, had its own specific traditions, and consequently the problem is involved with the history of later periods, in the light of which (when independently criticized) the phenomena may be more safely adjudged. What was thought, claimed, or taught, does not necessarily represent the true course of events.

P. 51, l. 2 from end. *For* "ver. 3" *read* "x. 3."

P. 82, n. 2, l. 1. *Read* "Num. xx. 1–13."

P. 137, l. 15. *Read* "xxvii. 1."

NOTES ON OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY

It has been said that those who make history rarely write it, and those who write it rarely understand it. To this it must be added that those who write about it not unfrequently fail to take into account the circumstances in which the history was made and the conditions under which it was put into writing. The history of the children of Israel is one of unique complexity chiefly because it is a religious history. As it has come down to us, it is so beset by internal difficulties that scholars have found themselves obliged to subject the evidence to a searching criticism which has been largely destructive. But if the result has been that it is now possible to trace the steady growth of Israel's religion and institutions, can it be denied that the reconstruction of her history, which is now generally adopted by critics, is no less full of problems? Yet, one believes that the work of literary criticism has not been in vain. Its results have been built up slowly and gradually, and the fact that there is practical unanimity among the critics themselves is (though it may savour of flippancy) a significant indication that they may be generally accepted. The "foundation" has been laid, and all are agreed upon the "structure," but there are many details of "architecture" and "decoration" wherein the builders and workmen are not yet in harmony. A glance at any of the recent histories of Israel proves this in a moment. It is notably the earlier traditions, the origins of Israel, which are especially obscure, and although some may fear that the evidence is too isolated and scanty to permit of any attempt to trace the first steps, this is no reason why the endeavour should not be honestly made.

It is this pre-monarchic period which I propose to consider, to notice certain narratives and certain historical difficulties which appear to invite attention. The studies which follow are all more or less independent of each other, although all bear directly upon the origins of Israel. I have throughout endeavoured to avoid fettering myself with preconceived theories or fancies, and have regarded the opening sentences of this paper not so much as a canon for the "higher critic," but as a warning when one passes judgment upon the historical questions one attempts to investigate.

Five years ago I published a series of conjectures on the literary analysis of 2 Samuel, in the course of which I ventured to propose a fundamental reconstruction of the narratives it contained. I had at the same time practically completed other notes upon the earlier narratives, but these seemed to lead to such far-reaching conclusions that I was unwilling to "rush into print" until I had seen the result of the earlier article. In the meantime I have not unnaturally found myself anticipated in several particulars, although in several cases I find that I have arrived at the same results as others on entirely different grounds. But the chief cause of delay has been naturally the publication of Professor Karl Budde's *Bücher Samuel* in Marti's *Kurzer Hand-Commentar* (1902) where this scholar did me the honour of subjecting my article to a close but invariably courteous criticism, which rendered a reconsideration of all my theories an indispensable preliminary to the publication of the later notes. I must confess at the outset that I have found no reason for departing from my main conclusions, although Budde's careful and sometimes severe criticisms have indicated weak spots in my arguments[1], which I gratefully acknowledge. I shall proceed, therefore, in the first section to recapitulate as briefly as possible the chief results contained in the article of 1900, with a few remarks upon the earlier chapters of David's life in 1 Samuel, and shall then endeavour to notice the objections that have been raised to my theory.

I. The Life of David[2].

The series of chapters known as the "court history of David" (2 Samuel ix-xx, continued in 1 Kings i, ii) has invariably been regarded as one of the best specimens of early Hebrew literature: continuous, the work of one almost contemporary writer, and, with rare exceptions, entirely free from interpolations and signs of redaction. It was precisely this section which I found occasion to attack; the chief problem being whether it was (as it purported to be) an account of the history of David's last years, or whether it did not

[1] Notably in my attempt to find support in the linguistic data, in my discussion of ch. vi, and in several small points of detail. On the other hand, Budde himself has perhaps gone too far in endeavouring to minimize the indications of unevenness which were noticed, and has not shown that boldness which marked his invaluable critical labours upon Judges and 1 Samuel.

[2] See more fully "Notes on the Composition of 2 Samuel," *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, vol. XVI (1900), pp. 145-77, here referred to by the page alone.

consist of a number of old narratives, originally distinct, belonging to various parts of the king's reign. It was primarily on historical and not on literary grounds that reconstruction was proposed. Any one who has read (let us say) the legends of King Arthur is aware that an impression of literary unity alone is no sound argument in favour of the genuineness of a piece of writing, and there appeared to be no *a priori* grounds for the conviction that the general view of the literary unity of the court history was unassailable. From a consideration of many internal difficulties, therefore, it was suggested that even as the chronicler wrongly supposed that David became king of all Israel immediately after the death of Saul (1 Chron. xi), so it was the incorrect view of some redactor of 2 Samuel that this event occurred as the necessary sequel to the death of Saul's son Ishbaal. We can correct the chronicler by the Books of Samuel; we can only conjecture that the latter give expression to an inaccurate view from a study of the internal evidence. One knows how later tradition idealized David and magnified his achievements; could one feel confident that the first step had not already been taken in 2 Samuel? One realized that the man who was the first king over all Israel, the first to unite the north and south, must have been a favourite figure in popular tradition. One has only to observe how the Bedouin of Syria and Palestine treasure the stories of old-time heroes in order to appreciate what David's personality must have meant to the sons of Israel; and when one perceives how the most impossible of all supernatural deeds are voted genuine by the existence of this or that place, one will scarcely assume too readily that the vivid local colouring of any particular story is *prima facie* evidence of its authenticity.

From a consideration of the evidence it was suggested that the revolt of Absalom must have preceded the great wars. The narrative (2 Sam. xv-xx) scarcely seemed to represent David as king over all Israel, and it appeared more probable that it was simply a rising in which the southern clans of Judah took part. Absalom had been at Geshur, a south Palestinian district[1], whose king was his maternal grandfather, the two leading men were Judaean, and the rebels met at Hebron (p. 159 sq.). Tradition had associated with it the northern tribes, partly because at some period they had no doubt tried to withstand David's yoke, and partly, also, to give effect to that feeling of national unity which (to take an example) transformed the exploits of local "judges" into matters of national moment. In consequence of this theory, chs. v-viii, xxi-xxiv were regarded

[1] Not the Aramaean state (pp. 153, 160), "in Aram," xv. 8, being treated as a gloss.

as originally forming a distinct source, and the remaining chapters were arranged provisionally: ii-iv (Ishbaal); ix (Meribbaal); xiii-xx (Absalom's revolt); x-xii (Ammonite war). Incidentally, this seemed to lead to two interesting corollaries. In the first place, when David fled to Mahanaim we are told that "Shobi the son of Nahash of Rabbah of the children of Ammon" was among those who brought David furniture and provisions (xvii. 27). The incident is the more valuable since Ammon and Saul's kingdom could not have been on friendly terms after 1 Sam. xi. But the passage is difficult in the original Hebrew, and, as Prof. H. P. Smith (*International Critical Commentary*) remarks on the words "and Shobi": "It is possible that a verb once stood here." "Shobi" is a curious name, for which no plausible explanation has been proposed, and one is tempted to read ויבא ("and . . . brought") for ושבי, and assume that "son of" was inserted to make sense after the verb had become illegible or corrupt (p. 164 sq.). Now, if it was really Nahash who received David so kindly, it is not surprising that when he was subsequently succeeded by his son Hanun, David should have been anxious to show his gratitude in a practical manner (x. 2; see below, p. 12, n. 2).

In addition to this, the birth of Solomon is now brought immediately before the revolt of Adonijah, an appropriate position considering the details of the intrigues in 1 Kings i-ii, and the reference to the king's promise to Bathsheba (i. 13, 17, 30), which may have been made shortly before. It is possible that the story of Bathsheba was originally independent of the Ammonite war, and after it had been brought into its present content the two chapters (x-xii) may have been placed earlier for one of two reasons. Thus, it is possible that when v-viii was introduced, it was desired to place the Ammonite war nearer to the other wars in ch. viii; or again it is possible that pragmatical motives have been at work. The latter seems the preferable view.

With Bathsheba and the birth of Solomon a new element of discord was introduced into the inevitable jealousies of the harem, and if she were indeed a granddaughter of the wily Ahithophel she may have been an adept at schemes and intrigues. At all events, we may couple Adonijah's revolt with the appearance of Bathsheba; a clearer motive for his action could not be expected. But if tradition knew of the earlier revolt of another son, might it not have concluded that this too originated after the birth of Solomon? Tradition knew, too, of the stain which besmirched the king's honour, and if David's success were due to his piety, his misfortunes must have been due to his sins. Sin and the punishment for sin act

and react upon one another in life and in tradition. The revolt of a dearly loved son might be viewed as a punishment for David's adultery, and the death of Absalom would purge the king's guilt and prepare the way for Solomon[1]. Certainly Adonijah's revolt, in spite of its far-reaching consequences, did not fasten itself upon the people's imagination as did that of Absalom, but yet where could we find a more important dissension among the military authorities and the priestly representatives? A closer study of 1 Kings i–ii appears to show that its obvious close connexion with the preceding chapters is not original; it is rather the work of an editor than of an early writer (pp. 172–4). If it is the aim of 1 Kings ii to remove from Solomon's shoulders the bloodshed incurred when he established his throne, every care has been taken to bring 2 Sam. xv–xx into close touch with it. Among other obscure details, perhaps the most striking are the passages relating to Joab. The treacherous murder of Abner and Amasa led to his fall (ii. 5), but the context deals entirely with Absalom's revolt (vv. 5–9), and the two crimes were apparently separated by many years. The episodes have a certain resemblance to each other (p. 168), and, although the story of Amasa is at present obscure, there is no doubt that according to Oriental custom Joab acted rightly in avenging the death of Asahel. H. P. Smith observes that "by tribal morality David as kinsman of Asahel was bound to take blood-revenge as much as Joab himself," and in spite of David's denunciation the death of Abner undoubtedly facilitated his move to the throne. Joab's expostulation (2 Sam. iii. 24 sq.) is in perfect harmony with his sturdy uncompromising character as exemplified in xix. 5–7. The latter passage has been taken as an indication that the general had the "old" king in his power, or it is assumed that his influence was increased after the episode of Uriah the Hittite. But there is nothing to show that David was afraid of Joab; the fact that he is said to have replaced him by Amasa points to the contrary. And if we choose to assume that Joab was degraded because he had killed Absalom (xviii. 14), it is remarkable that no allusion is made to this in David's charges to Solomon. Hence I was tempted to conjecture that during the (alleged) redaction steps were taken to give effect to a feeling of bitter hostility towards the sons of Zeruiah.

Animosity towards Joab, an emphatic representation of David's

[1] So, not only could Absalom's death be regarded as a penalty for David's crime, but efforts could be made to remove the stain upon Solomon's birth (p. 156 sq.), and finally the steps by which Solomon came to the throne might be viewed not, as taken upon the king's responsibility alone, but as directly due to David's last charges.

good will to the house of Saul, and the desire to throw back as early as possible the date of his accession to the kingship over all Israel, appear to have been the leading motives, and as a general result of my criticisms I ventured to draw two main conclusions (p. 177): (1) the union of Judah and Israel under one king did not occur at an early date in David's reign; and (2) those narratives which reflect a close relationship between Judah and Israel (or Benjamin) previous to this union do not go back to the oldest account of David's life, but are more probably due to an Ephraimite source. These passages tend to combine the histories of David and the house of Saul, and emphasize the king's consistent generosity towards the unfortunate dynasty (based partly upon a friendship which was said to subsist between David and Jonathan). They also betray here and there a marked bitterness towards Joab. Further, subsequent history shows how loose was the bond uniting north and south; and the ease with which they separated after a few years of joint rule under David and Solomon favours the view that Judah previous to this union had *never* stood in any close relationship to Israel (or Benjamin).

The bearing of these conclusions upon David's history in 1 Samuel was briefly indicated at the close of the article, and it was pointed out that according to the investigations of Budde it was significant that the source of his life at Saul's court was almost wholly Ephraimite; in his life as an outlaw the Judaean narrative predominates, and in his fortunes as an independent chieftain (xxvii, xxix sq.), the sources are wholly Judaean. We can, in fact, distinguish three separate phases: (1) David, the son of Jesse of Bethlehem, a familiar figure at the court of Saul, son-in-law of the king, and the favourite of the people. (2) David, the outlaw, with a few hundred men, never free from danger, and continually hunted by the relentless Saul. To this we must add the important fact that he has the sole survivor of the priestly family on his side. (3) Finally, we have the David who goes to Ziklag with his two wives and his men, "every man with his household." Here he establishes a footing in the country, and by politic gifts to the sheikhs south of Hebron took the first step which led to Jerusalem. It is to be observed that these three situations appear to take David further and further south, and sever ever more irretrievably his early association with Israel. Arguing from (1), we should have expected David to become king over Israel at an earlier period than the tradition itself supposes[1]. We hear no more

[1] The Chronicler in this respect is more consistent in his view that men of all the tribes of Israel fell away from Saul and came to David at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii).

of his parents—a redactor has taken the precaution to send them to Moab, the country against which David waged war some—how many?—years later. If we can easily bridge over the gulf which separates (3) from David at Hebron, the narratives scarcely allow us to fill the gaps between (1) and (2), (2) and (3) in a satisfactory manner. H. P. Smith suggests that 1 Sam. xxv "may have followed immediately upon xix. 18–24 in a life of Samuel"; the former chapter is of a distinctive character compared with its surroundings, but the gulf between the two can scarcely be bridged over. Again, since xxvi and xxiv are duplicates, and xxiii. 19–29 (David among the Ziphites) is to be connected with xxiv, whilst xxiii. 15–18 is "a distinct insertion," it follows that xxvii. 1 is to be joined to xxiii. 14. The latter verse reads like a summing up of the history, so far as relates to this part of David's life, and the constant danger of his position is the prelude to the desperate step he took in throwing himself upon the mercy of the Philistines (xxvii. 1). These indications suffice to show the scantiness of the several traditions. But many of the incidents are extremely obscure. If David delivered Keilah from the Philistines, and the place was not in Judah, by whom was it occupied? and is it natural that he should willingly incur the anger of the Philistines by this hostile deed? Is it not strange, also, that the five Philistine princes marched north to Shunem and Jezreel to fight Saul whose home was in Gibeah of Benjamin, and that David's presence is not noticed until they reached their destination?

The site of Ziklag is unfortunately unknown, although if it was given to David by Achish, king of Gath, it was presumably near Gath. But this does not agree with Josh. xv. 31, xix. 5, and a more southerly site is required[1]. If xxvii. 8, 10 means anything at all, it must signify that David's raid against Geshurites, Girzites (?), and Amalekites would not have commended itself to Achish, whilst a raid against the steppes of Judah, of the Jerahmeelites, and of the Kenites would lead Achish to believe that David "had broken finally with Israel and would be his perpetual vassal" (H. P. Smith). In other words, the latter are Israelite, the former conceivably Philistine. Nor is it easy to see the relation these bear to the geographical indications in xxx. 14, where the Amalekites retaliate by ravaging not merely Ziklag, but also the steppes of the Cherethites and of the Calebites. And finally, when David sent of the spoil to the

[1] This outlandish name may be for *Ḥaluṣa* (Cheyne), but if we may infer that it must have been to the south of Hebron, one is tempted to conjecture that עקלץ is a corruption of Isaac (יצחק) or Isaac-el (יצחקאל), on the analogy of Joseph-el and Jacob-el.

cities of the Jerahmeelites, the Kenites, and other cities extending to Hebron, are we to infer that these were the districts despoiled by "the enemies of Yahweh" (xxx. 26; cp. Exod. xvii. 16), or did he use the recaptured booty to win the hearts of other clans by tactful gifts? It is easy to say that all these are the heterogeneous elements of which the (later) tribe of Judah was composed, but is that very satisfactory?

The question of the "Philistines" will come up for consideration in a subsequent section. For the present, it is enough to observe that, although we hear much of the Philistines in North Judah and Benjamin, we have no old traditions regarding the expulsion or subjugation of the Canaanites from that district (2 Sam. v. 6-9 excepted). As for Achish, one may wonder whether the superscription to Psalm xxxiv with its mention of Abimelech is a mere error. Abimelech was "king of the Philistines at Gerar" (Gen. xxvi), and David's visit to Achish of Gath is curiously reminiscent of Isaac's visit to Abimelech at Gerar and the covenant between them[1]. We may at all events feel sure that if tradition associated David's youth with the south of Judah, and actually sent him to the wilderness of Paran[2], there must have been some definite object in view. Paran is practically the district around Kadesh; it is associated with the Levites; Bethlehem (the traditional home of David) appears on two noteworthy occasions closely connected with Levites (Judges xvii. 7; xix. 1); the chronicler has associated with David's life the inauguration of Levitical and priestly classes—are these three facts independent of each other, or can any connecting link be found?

I shall now proceed to notice the objections that have been raised against my theory of the composition of 2 Samuel by Professor Budde and private correspondents; they are based partly upon literary, and partly upon historical grounds, and I shall endeavour to summarize them as fairly as possible. My attempt to find in 2 Samuel Judaean and Ephraimite narratives as in 1 Samuel may be willingly given up as a general principle, and, were I presenting the theory anew in full, I would feel more attracted by such a literary scheme as H. P. Smith has adopted in his commentary[3].

[1] I notice that Winckler (*Gesch. Israels*, II, 183) has felt the same difficulty as regards Achish, king of Gath, and suggests that he has taken the place of a king of Muṣri, that is of a district further to the south of Palestine.

[2] xxv. 1, LXX, has Maon, clearly the easier reading (cp. xxv. 2 sqq.), but how are we to account for the text? The more obvious reading is not necessarily original.

[3] Budde's own labours on Judges and Samuel have perhaps prejudiced him. To argue that x in A is not a sign of an Ephraimite source because

(1) In the first place, it has been pointed out by several that "it is incredible to believe that David's history should have been so obscured or glossed during the comparatively short interval between David and the date of the Judaean narrative (middle of eighth century)." To this it is to be observed that it is not to the earliest narrator, but to a later redactor, that the present arrangement is due. No one will suppose that the famine and pestilence in 2 Sam. xxi and xxiv fell between Sheba's revolt and that of Adonijah, and even as it is allowed that later theory has obscured the lives of Samuel and Saul, so, later theory, too, according to my argument, must be held responsible for the position of Absalom's revolt.

(2) Again, it is said that the chronological difficulties involved are too serious, and if (as was argued) the Geshur to which Absalom fled was in South Palestine (cp. Josh. xiii. 2), they are only increased; David (it is objected) could not have become the son-in-law of the king of Geshur until he had himself become king, therefore not before he was anointed at Hebron; Absalom was not the firstborn, and we must allow time for David to strengthen his position before he could make such an alliance; Absalom could not have been very young when he revolted, and hence it follows we must allow anywhere between twenty and thirty years for David's reign in Hebron; this leaves no time for his deeds as king over Israel, indeed he would be too old to conduct campaigns against Ammon, Moab, and Edom, and it is strange that the history of the north is blank all these years; finally, at the time of the revolt of Absalom David was an old man, too old to go out to war.

In connexion with these objections, as regards the "king" of Geshur who (as a support to the theory of the Judaean revolt under Absalom) I took to be a south Palestinian and not a Syrian chief[1], Budde holds that since Geshur is omitted from the list of Syrian allies of Ammon (2 Sam. x. 6), there is reason to infer that David had married one of its princesses, and he remarks that it must first be made probable that a necessarily small tribe of the southern steppes had a "king." As for David, he observes, it was of no small importance for him to ally himself with a "real king," and this would not have been for him a difficult task.

it occurs elsewhere in B, C, and D which are Judaean, is not convincing if B, C, and D are in their turn also Ephraimite. Occasionally, also, the linguistic criteria (upon which I laid undue weight) may be successfully removed by ingenious emendation. So מְרַגְּלִים "spies" (a sign of E) in xv. 10 is replaced by מַלְאָכִים "messengers," or the word is "einfach als falsche Ausdeutung zu streichen."

[1] So years ago Stähelin thought of the south Geshur (*Leben David's*, 1866, p. 29).

In reply to this, I must confess that I see no sound reason for the supposition that a "king" of the northern Geshur would be a greater potentate or a more helpful ally than one of the south. It is good policy for a king to strengthen or increase his influence and position by useful alliances, and since David had married Abigail of Caleb, and Ahinoam of Jezreel, and had sent round presents to the sheikhs of the country south of Hebron, it seemed not improbable that David had also married into the south Geshur. "King" of course must not be pressed too far. There was a king of Arad (Num. xxi. 1), seventy kings fed under Adoni-bezek's table (Judges i. 7), and they were plentiful in Canaan (Joshua x sq.). One does not regard them as "real kings," their power can be comprehended best by comparing the authority of the Canaanite chiefs in the Amarna Tablets. After all, David's position at Hebron was not a grand one, and a "real king" might hesitate to give his daughter in marriage to one who a few years before had been a roving outlaw.

Next, the chronology. Was Absalom born at Hebron (iii. 2–5)? If the framework of the notice be correct, one must allow that Amnon and Chileab were born at Hebron, although David was already married to Abigail and Ahinoam some time before he went to Ziklag, and there he is said to have lived sixteen months (1 Sam. xxv. 42 sq., xxvii. 7)[1]. But the passage is admitted to be an interpolation, and Budde places it before v. 13–16, and this being so, it is only natural that the editor should have brought his list into harmony with the context by means of the opening and closing statement that the sons whose names he quotes were born at Hebron. Moreover, if David only passed seven or eight years at Hebron, how old were these sons when he moved to Jerusalem and made them (and also the sons born at Jerusalem) serve as priests (2 Sam. viii. 18)? Is it necessary to insist that Absalom was born at Hebron?

Clearly we do not know how old Absalom was when he revolted, and if Jehoash and Azariah could reign at the age of seven and sixteen respectively, I do not think the question is one that could be profitably investigated. Certainly, it was eleven years after the murder of Amnon according to the chronology, but it seems extremely probable that the data are not genuine[2]. It seems rather inconsistent

[1] In ch. xxv which leads up to David's marriage with Abigail he is represented as the chief of a band of roving followers, but he goes down to Ziklag with his two wives, and a band of men "every man with his household" (xxvii. 3). Will it be held that there is no gap between the two situations?

[2] The eleven years is reduced to nine by arbitrarily supposing (with Budde) that the four years of xv. 7 (so LXX) include the two of xiv. 28.

to accept them because they tell against the theory of the early date of the revolt, and to reject the notices in ii. 11 which imply a period of five and a half years between the death of Ishbaal and David's accession to the throne in Jerusalem, and thus incidentally support the argument that from a historical point of view ch. v. 1–3 does *not* follow immediately after iv. On these grounds, it is not necessary to assume that David reigned "twenty to thirty years in Hebron[1]"; the narrative of the revolt may give one the impression that Absalom is a young impetuous man, but "impressions" alone can scarcely serve as evidence. At all events it cannot be admitted that David is here represented as an old man and that he would be far too old to wage the wars against Ammon and Moab which I have placed later. For, firstly, is it reasonable to expect one to fix the age at which a king must be supposed to be too old to go to war? Secondly, even after a skirmish with the Philistines David was adjured not to go out to battle again lest the "light of Israel" be quenched (xxi. 16 sq.). Finally, if David is dissuaded from taking part in the battle against Absalom (xviii. 3, see Budde, *ad loc.*) there are other motives at work. David was unwilling to take a hand in fighting with his beloved son, the loss of Absalom meant more to him than the glory of victory; and, if this be not enough, the verse seems to imply that the king could send out reserves if necessary. David left Joab to conduct the war against Abner (ii–iv), but this is not usually taken as an event in his old age. Will it, therefore, be seriously maintained that the energetic king who conducts operations in xv–xix, and who (according to Budde) took his wives with him in his flight to Mahanaim (see p. 15 below), was old and feeble like the David of Adonijah's revolt (1 Kings i)? If, as is usually held, the latter follows upon Absalom's rebellion, is it not at least striking that now (and only now) the narrative takes pains to show that the king had reached a good old age (1 Kings i. 1–3)? No doubt the chronological notices in xiii–xv represent some scheme, and the most probable appears to be that according to which Solomon was twelve years old when he came to the throne (p. 160). But such notices are not rarely suspicious, and if they are to be rejected it is perhaps enough if one can lay the finger upon their probable origin.

(3) Again, as regards the proposal to place the Ammonite war *after* the revolt, certain counter-arguments have been put forward. Budde (*Sam.* 246 sq.), for example, deems it more probable that the

[1] Nor need the blank in the history of the northern tribes from the death of Ishbaal to the time of David's supremacy over all Israel, prove a stumblingblock. Are there no blanks in the history of Israel?

first relations between David and Ammon were warlike, and that later they became on a more friendly footing; if Nahash king of Ammon died in the early part of David's reign, his son Hanun might very well have been old enough to ascend the throne a few years later; naturally David cultivated friendly relations with one who would be Ishbaal's foe, and the reference in x. 2 has no deeper meaning; but now that David had no longer a rival, but held the sovereignty, the Ammonites would regard him as an enemy, and his treatment of Moab and Edom would make them suspicious. All this (according to Budde) speaks for the early part of David's reign. Subsequently, it is observed, when Ammon was no longer a separate state, we actually find that Shobi, the brother of the vanquished Hanun, is not called "king," clearly because he is only David's governor. The refutation thus appears complete in every detail.

In reply to these objections, one must confess that they are to an extent as hypothetical as the reconstructions I suggested, and the question must turn rather upon the degree of probability. Nahash was king of Ammon (1 Sam. xi) before David appears upon the scene, and it has been argued that he must have been dead however early the revolt occurred. This is scarcely a question of the age to which kings live, and it seems much more remarkable that Achish, the king of David's early youth, should have lived to a few years after his protégé's death (1 Kings ii. 39)[1]! Again (in the absence of evidence) it is surely a matter of opinion whether warlike relations precede friendly, or vice versa, and whether x. 2 has some subtle allusion or is merely diplomatic etiquette[2].

It is of course not unlikely that the Ammonites would resent David's increased power, and the same has been said of the Philistines, who (it is supposed) allowed David to war with Ishbaal, and only intervened when he had conquered and become king over the whole land[3]. But would not Edom and Moab also rise in arms? Surely if

[1] The follower of the tradition will observe that Saul reigned only two years (1 Sam. xiii. 1), but the tradition is not reliable.

[2] The critics are at variance: H. P. Smith supposes that Nahash had helped David in his early struggles. Budde now says "es handelt sich um feststehende Gebräuche." Winckler in 1895 (*Gesch. Israels*, I, 213) was convinced that the reference was only to neighbourliness. In 1900 he seems to have changed his views (II, 181). Cheyne (*Encyc. Bib.*, col. 3258) notes that "The statement that he (Nahash) had 'shown kindness' to David has been much discussed. The 'kindness' cannot have been passed over in the records, and yet where does the traditional text mention it?" So much depends upon whether one is supporting or contesting existing theories.

[3] On pp. 150, 152, 154 it is argued that the fights with the Philistines

the traditional view is to be followed, it is only right that some attempt be made to sketch a plausible sequence of events. One knows that the great wars are summarized in 2 Sam. viii. The chapter ends with a passage "which evidently marks the conclusion of a section of the narrative" (H. P. Smith). The "impression" gained is that v–viii owe their position here to an editor[1] who has collected much miscellaneous matter, similar as regards contents to that which is found in xxi–xxiv. There, they are admittedly out of chronological order, and it is scarcely less doubtful that the incidents in v–viii are not to be viewed as consecutive. Their position suggests an early part of David's reign. The "impression" left by ch. viii is that we have a concluding panegyric, probably of different periods. These successful wars against the Philistines, Moabites, Ammonites, Syrians, Edomites (and ver. 12 adds the Amalekites!) were obviously not waged at one time, simply because each viewed David's step with jealousy and hostility. If David adopted a natural policy his defeated foes in one war would be his mercenaries or allies in the next; to assume that they rose against him each in turn would be unreasonable.

To wage these wars, large armies of seasoned troops were required, whereas David fled from before Absalom with a mere bodyguard consisting perhaps of foreigners (xv. 18). It would not be unnatural to suppose that (adopting the current view) the northern tribes submitted to David's yoke in order to fight a common enemy, and only revolted when the land was at peace, but it has yet to be proved that they actually did revolt (see below, p. 17). And if we assume that they did join with Judah, it is strange that although they disappear from the narrative in a state of half-suppressed hostility (xx. 2), Joab leads the bodyguard—and not an army—through their territory as though nothing had happened. Moreover, David's wars had raised Israel to the position of the greatest of the western states, whereas the whole tenor of the early stages of the revolt unmistakably emphasizes his desperate position. Resistance was out of the question until he had collected a few warriors to his side[2]. But where—following the traditional view—were the decimated Ammonites, the despoiled Moabites, the subjugated Philistines, and that inveterate foe, the Edomites? They neither attempted to regain

in v, xxi, xxiii were to be placed at an early date before David became king of Israel.

[1] Or editors, the introductory notice being twofold (v. 3 and v. 1, 2; p. 154).

[2] 4,000 according to Josephus (*Ant.*, vii. 101), and the moderate estimate (contrast e. g. 1 Sam. xi. 8) invites confidence.

their independence nor did they join cause with Absalom. This was no sudden rising; widespread preparations had been made beforehand, and yet at the critical time the hostile peoples are quiet.

As an incidental part of the reconstruction, the theory proposed "ganz aus der Welt zu schaffen" the unfortunate Shobi to join the unlucky Vashni in the tents of Minnith and Pannag[1]. To infer from the absence of such a title as "king of Ammon" that the land was no longer independent is hardly justifiable; the passage mentions homes not official designations (xvii. 27). Even Hanun himself is not called "king" of Ammon[2], and the war in x–xii is not with Hanun the king but with the Ammonites. One does not infer that when "Hiram, king of Tyre, sent messengers to David" (v. 11) that the latter had not yet become king; allowance must be made for the narrator's style and fancy (contrast viii. 6 and 10).

It has also been objected that xvii. 27 presupposes ix, and Meribbaal could not have been taken from the care of Machir of Lo-debar until David had settled in Jerusalem, and had become king of Israel, *ergo* Absalom's revolt must be placed later in David's reign. This brings us to a difficulty in the narrative which has to be faced, whether the new theory or the traditional view be accepted. No doubt Machir's friendliness to David at Mahanaim was intended to be viewed as a grateful return for the king's kindness to Meribbaal (ix), even as the troubles which befell the king were regarded as a fitting retribution for his fall in the matter of Bathsheba and his treatment of the sons of Saul (xxi). But as analogy shows, it is not the original writer but the later reader who loves to associate cause and effect and point a moral to the tale, and, further, the "impression of literary unity," in other words, the intimate connexion of the narratives one with the other, is due to editorial skill. One learns from experience that cross-references and the like are the work of the editors, not of the contributors! Contrast for example the simple straightforward passages in 1 Sam. ix. 1–14, 15—x. 1 with the cross-references x. 5–8. The fact that Saul's rejection at Gilgal (1 Sam. xiii. 8–15) points back to x. 8 does not make it genuine, and if the account of his anointing (x. 17–27) is connected with chaps. viii, xii, and xv, it is not assumed that viii–xv inclusive are therefore by one hand. The indications of redaction in the court history are certainly less superficial than in 1 Samuel, but a careful study of the book seems to prove their presence. To notice one insignificant example: when we find that the reference in Nathan's speech to Absalom's conduct (xii. 11) is

[1] See the *Encyc. Bib.* on these names.

[2] But "lord" (אָדוֹן), x. 3.

regarded as a gloss, I must maintain my former suggestion (p. 162) that the act in question (xvi. 22, cp. xv. 16, xx. 3) is alike intrusive. The passages fit in loosely, and have all the appearance of being interpolated. Budde, if I understand aright, concludes from the specific reference to David's concubines that David in his hurried flight took his wives with him. Thus we are to suppose that the "aged" king, supported only by a mere bodyguard, flees in haste from the capital, but takes the precaution to remove his wives[1]. Or, may we not rather believe that the story of the revolt as it passed from mouth to mouth was made the vehicle for inculcating a lesson? We know what Absalom's act meant to the Oriental mind, it was simply a step which the successful usurper took as a matter of right; and it seems far more probable that when the narratives were made an object lesson, popular tradition should have made David suffer in a characteristic manner in return for his treacherous conduct towards Uriah the Hittite.

Tradition, possibly an Ephraimite one, but in all probability of comparatively late origin, saw in David's extremity a fitting punishment for the blood of the house of Saul (xvi. 6-8; cp. xxi). The instrument is one Shimei, a Benjamite, and the part which this tribe plays in the revolt is not free from obscurity. Shimei himself could muster a thousand tribesmen (xix. 17), no inconsiderable gathering considering the period. Meribbaal, too, appears to have hoped to seize the opportunity to build up the fortunes of Saul's house, and if he explains his behaviour with a very intelligible excuse (xix. 24-30), he is nevertheless condemned to lose half his estate. But there is no concerted action; they are merely independent lay figures; and whilst Shimei's outspoken language represents what some thought of David's dealings with the Gibeonites, Meribbaal's humble attitude is an acknowledgment of the king's favour to the son of an old friend. The emphatic manner in which certain narratives insist upon David's good will towards the house of Saul may reflect the sentiments of conquered tribes anxious to point to an early covenant bond between conquered and conquerors, but the attitude of David in xxi is so entirely distinct and archaic from a religious point of view that it must strike one as representing an older tradition. Budde, still maintaining his original reconstruction, places xxi. 1-14 before ix, and finds in the words of Shimei (xvi. 7 sq.) and the appearance of Meribbaal (xvi. 1-4, xix. 24-30) support for his view. Whatever we

[1] It would be equally justifiable and rash to assume that Bathsheba and Solomon accompanied the king, and with more justice, inasmuch as Absalom (it might be argued) would be only too glad to put the young child out of the way!

may think of David's covenant with Jonathan, there is no difficulty in assuming that David's inquiry[1] should follow as soon as possible after the death of Ishbaal (iv). If xxi intervenes, we must allow an interval of at least three years (ver. 1), which makes David's kindness somewhat belated[2]. Here, the Gibeonites have demanded and received seven of Saul's descendants, and have executed their vengeance upon them. We may treat ver. 7 as a gloss or not, but it is at least plausible to imagine that if seven sons could be found, the whereabouts of Jonathan's son could hardly be quite unknown. The sequel, with the pathetic picture of Rizpah, is well known, but it is not until this juncture that David thinks of interring the remains of all the survivors in the sepulchre of Kish, the father of Saul. Nor does it seem quite appropriate, to our ideas at least, that after seven sons had thus met their fate, David should inquire whether any more were left[3]. May one not believe that when xxi. 1–14 found a place in 2 Samuel, Shimei was assigned his present somewhat unnatural rôle (p. 170 sq.), and that when the story of Meribbaal formed part of the present narratives, he too had to find a place in the revolt (p. 169 sq.)?

Again, is it "only natural" that David fled to Mahanaim (so Budde), or is it not rather remarkable? If, following the tradition, Israel was up in arms against the king, why should he take refuge in Ishbaal's capital? And if, following the theory, he was not yet king, why flee to Mahanaim? Could he hope for succour here? Had it been Ammon, we could understand his motive. But supposing this belongs to an early date, before war broke out with Ishbaal, might this not be a good reason for his generous sentiments towards Saul's descendants? The problem would be simplified if it could be agreed whether Israel did or did not take part in the revolt. Judah alone is prominent throughout; the men of Israel (like Aaron in the older narratives) appear only to disappear. If one considers the preparations for the revolt, how Absalom sowed disaffection among men of the tribes of Israel (xv. 2–6), and after four years' delay (so LXX) sent round messengers to rouse Israel to action, it is scarcely conceivable that this is the true account of the commencement[4]. Although

[1] "Is there yet any that is left of the house of Saul, that I may show him kindness for Jonathan's sake" (ix. 1).

[2] No doubt the three years in ver. 1 may be easily rejected henceforth, but will this remove the difficulty?

[3] If Meribbaal lived at David's court knowing full well the fate of his relatives, is not his grateful acknowledgment in xix. 28 a little forced?

[4] It was suggested that ver. 7 contains the oldest account of the commencement of the revolt. On its possible object, see p. 160 sq.

the hostility of the tribes is patent (ver. 13), and they come to Jerusalem with Absalom (xvi. 15), yet Hushai counsels the young prince to gather the people from "Dan to Beersheba," and to this advice "all the men of Israel" agreed (xvii. 11–14). After the battle it is the men of Judah who have to be reconciled, for "Israel" had fled to their tents (xix. 8), and when Judah came to Gilgal to escort the king, only "half the people of Israel" were present (xix. 40). Even at this moment there was hostility between Judah and Israel, and when Sheba the Benjamite seized the occasion to raise a fresh revolt, "all the men of Israel went up from following David and followed Sheba" (xx. 2). But they are heard of no more. Sheba's followers are his clansmen only, as small a gathering as that of Shimei, and there is nothing to show (as far as the present narratives are concerned) whether the ill-feeling had died down by the time we reach 1 Kings i. Hence not only was it held that the size of the revolt had been exaggerated, but the present position of Sheba's revolt was merely due to redaction (p. 166 sq.). "It would have been madness," as H. P. Smith admits[1], "to revolt after the suppression of Absalom," and, apart from the question of probability, the present literary form of the passage points to the work of an editor. To this Budde dissents. The suggestion that Sheba's revolt had been appended by a redactor who had in his mind the story of the parting of the two kingdoms (1 Kings xii. 16–20) is rejected; the reverse, according to Budde, is more probable. But it is not surprising that popular tradition should have brought together revolts of different periods and by different tribes, and if it will be admitted that Sheba's rising represents an attempt of Benjamin to contest the authority of David the situation becomes more clear. David's army has sunk down to the bodyguard again (xx. 7), and Budde's objection that David's men would scarcely pursue Sheba and his clan through the length of North Israel applies equally to the traditional view, which represents Israel as parting from Judah in hostility. Surely it is more remarkable that David should have fled to Mahanaim to escape Judah and Israel, and that Saul and his servant wandered about in search of some lost asses in a country which was groaning under the yoke of the Philistines (1 Sam. ix. 16).

In conclusion, it is not amiss that we should remind ourselves of Robertson Smith's words, nearly thirty years ago, in his article "David" in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*: "The Biblical narratives are not so constructed as to enable us to decide in chronological order the thirty-three years of David's reign over all Israel." They represent a view which is very generally admitted and the questions

[1] *Old Testament History*, p. 149, n. 2 (Edinburgh, 1903).

I have raised imply that we should probably include also the seven years that David was king over Judah at Hebron. Whatever opinion may ultimately be held regarding the sequence of events and the extent of redaction, it is only right that those who take the traditional or even the "moderate" position should endeavour to offer some reasonably consistent scheme. The life of David is the turning-point in early Hebrew history, and on that account the narratives require the closest examination from the historical as well as from the literary side. These involve a discussion of the situation before David's time, the lives of Saul and Samuel, and the stories of the Book of Judges, a consideration of which will be undertaken in the following sections.

II. Saul.

Time and tradition have not dealt kindly with the memory of the first king of Israel. Textual confusion has given him a paltry two years' reign (1 Sam. xiii. 1), and editorial theory has made him rejected but a short while after his accession (xiii. 8–14). Throughout, the priestly or prophetic party are against him, and one is almost inclined to feel that tradition is having its revenge upon Saul for the wickedness of the people in desiring a king. The greater part of the life-history of Saul is bound up either with Samuel or with David. He is overshadowed, in the one case, by the seer and prophet who ranks with Moses and Elijah; in the other, by the youth who is one day to reign over his kingdom. So, Saul is not represented in a favourable light: he is petulant, mad with insane jealousy, treacherous and ungrateful, and plays a sorry part by the side of the austere Samuel or the gracious David. In the few chapters where Saul is not made subservient to these two we gain, I think, a more pleasing picture of the king. That he was at heart a devout worshipper of Yahweh appears, for example, in 1 Sam. xiv. 35, where he builds his *first* altar to Yahweh. That he was brave and courageous—even in death—is familiar to every one, and the hold he had upon the people's heart comes out clearly in the well-known quotation from the Book of Jashar (2 Sam. i). This essentially secular passage testifies to the feeling of gratitude which the people had for the hero who delivered them from the Philistines and enriched them with the booty of war; Saul and his son Jonathan are a heroic pair, who were not to be divided even in death—a very different picture from what some of the preceding chapters would have led one to expect, and pleasing in its obvious simplicity. In point of fact, the really genuine old narratives relating to the history of Saul and his kingdom are lamentably few, and such as they are—e. g. his wars (xiv. 47 sq.)—have to be carefully examined.

For the earlier part of his life critics are now tolerably agreed that the only historical passages are to be found in 1 Sam. ix–x. 16, xi, xiii (omitting vers. 7 *b*–15 *a*) and xiv. That even the older portions are not free from serious difficulties is recognized, and helpful solutions have been proposed. In xiii it is evident that two situations are

represented. In one (*a*) the Philistines have invaded Israel, and are encamped in Michmash ; the Israelites are put to flight, and take refuge across the Jordan in rocks and holes. Saul alone with a small band remains in Gilgal (xiii. 5–7). In the other (*b*) Saul is operating with a still smaller body of six hundred men at Gibeah (cp. xiii. 15*b*–16), clearly an excessively small number of men to put the Philistines to flight. H. P. Smith (*Sam.*, p. 94), who has not failed to recognize this absence of homogeneity in xiii, accordingly proposes to treat the whole of vers. 4–15*a* as an excerpt from a different source. But it is preferable to consider the situation in connexion with xiv, where it appears probable that the same twofold representation can be traced. For, as a careful comparison of the two chapters shows, the great Philistine invasion and the consequent flight of the people[1] presents a state of affairs which agrees very well with the notice of the marauding bands in xiii. 17 sq., and implies that the enemy had practically taken possession of the country. The obscure account of the lack of arms in Israel (xiii. 19–22) is not altogether strange in such a context, and the general effect goes to suggest that it is most unlikely that Jonathan's exploit (xiv. 1 sqq.) is associated with it in any way. In the latter, the rival camps are at Michmash and Geba, and Saul is at Gibeah surrounded by his six hundred men and the representatives of the priests (ver. 3, cp. xiii. 15). Jonathan, accompanied by his armour-bearer, proposes to make an attack upon the Philistine garrison, and intends to take the first words of the watchmen as an omen. "If they say, 'Come up,' we will go up, for Yahweh hath delivered them into our hand." The Philistine's challenge is the required sign, and the two Hebrews throw the garrison into confusion (xiv. 1–13). Only ver. 11*b* reads strangely in its present connexion ; the Philistines, before replying, cry to one another : " Behold, the Hebrews are come forth from the holes where they hid themselves." This can only be a reference to xiii. 6, which belongs to (*a*) ; and it does not seem rash to look for further traces of this situation in the chapter. These are perhaps to be found in vers. 21 sq., the return of the fugitives, and in the general impression given by the narrative[2].

If the account of Jonathan's exploit (xiv. 1–11 *a*, 12, 13 . . . ?) reflects a situation corresponding to (*b*), the rest of the narrative allows one to gain some idea of the sequel to (*a*). The great fight in which Israel

[1] One is reminded of the situation after the fight on Mount Gilboa.

[2] Ad. Lods, too, has found evidence of conflation and composition in ch. xiv (see *Études de Théologie*, &c., Paris, 1901, pp. 259–284). Budde's objections ignore historical difficulties, and arise from an uncompromising retention of a hard-and-fast theory of the literary sources.

was victorious was evidently an earthquake: there was a quaking in the land "among all the people, the garrison (gloss to connect with *a*), and the spoilers (cp. xiii. 17), they also trembled" (ver. 15)[1]. Their ranks were broken; the Hebrews who had been pressed into the service of the Philistines deserted and clustered around Saul, and the enemy were routed to a point beyond Beth-horon (so ver. 23). That one of Joshua's great battles reads like a reflection of this event has suggested itself also to H. P. Smith (*O. T. History*, p. 82)[2], and it is a valuable gain to find some historical foundation for what has frequently been regarded as untrustworthy romance (Josh. x). It is an interesting detail that the Book of Jashar should be quoted here also (x. 12 sq.), since it is to the same source that we are indebted for another valuable sidelight upon the character of Saul (2 Sam. i). The original continuation of the narrative in 1 Sam. xiv has perhaps been expanded. The story of the violation of Saul's tabu by Jonathan (vers. 24–35) opens in the LXX with an introductory description, "And Israel was with Saul, about ten thousand men, and the battle was spread over Mount Ephraim[3]." Again, in ver. 31, there is another description: "And they smote on that day among the Philistines from Michmash to Aijalon" (or with Lucian's text, "more than at Michmash"). Still proceding, it is not until after another diversion that Saul proposes to go down by night and spoil the already smitten Philistines (ver. 36), and it seems far from unlikely that interpolation is responsible for the present form of Saul's great fight[4]. One remarkably interesting piece of information is the account of the first altar Saul built unto Yahweh (ver. 35). It is one which we could ill spare, and the words, "Roll ye (גלו ver. 33) a great stone," suggest that the scene was originally laid in Gilgal. The erection of this altar is not merely an episode in the pursuit of the Philistines, but more probably a memorial of his great victory (cp. Exod. xvii. 15)[5].

This theory of a twofold situation finds subsidiary support elsewhere. ix. 16 states that the Philistines are oppressing the Israelites,

[1] Whence the obscure הרדי in xiii. 7 has perhaps arisen.

[2] Cp. *J. Q. R.*, 1904, p. 418.

[3] The rest of this verse may have been "Saul sinned a great sin (or perhaps rather 'had laid a great tabu') on that day" (see H. P. Smith, Budde).

[4] For analogous cases, where editors have inserted passages by means of brief topographical introductions, cp. 2 Sam. xv. 18, 23, 30; xix. 15 sq., 24, 31, 40 (see *A. J. S. L.*, XVI, pp. 161 sq., 169 sqq.).

[5] It perhaps came after ver. 23 *a*, where the day's work is summed up, vers. 31–34 are probably an aetiological legend; cp. again incidents in the story of Joshua (ch. iv; origin of the name Gilgal).

and that Yahweh will send a deliverer. This can be no other than Saul, and therefore *not* his son Jonathan, whatever the sequel of the latter's exploit may have been. But xiii. 3 apparently anticipates the feat (Geba, not Michmash), and if xiii. 4 inconsistently ascribes it to Saul, this is only what Samuel's charge (x. 5 *a*) would lead us to expect[1]. These charges are so complete that the allusion to the Philistines can scarcely be pointless. Thus, we read here (*a*) the place where the lost asses are to be found (x. 2), (*b*) the meeting with the men who are going up to Bethel, probably an allusion to xi (cp. xi. 4, and see below), (*c*) a reference to the Philistines (ver. 5 *a*), (*d*) the meeting with the band of prophets (vers. 5 *b*, 6), cp. vers. 10–13, and finally (*e*) the order to go down to Gilgal (ver. 8), which is the preparation for xiii. 8–15. That the last is a gloss is generally admitted, but it seems highly probable that the charges have at least been expanded from time to time[2]. It has been held by some that the whole account of Saul's introduction to Samuel is younger than xiii and xiv, and certainly the part which the seer plays in the account of Jabesh-Gilead (xi), at all events, is very clearly due to later redaction. Further, there is the familiar difficulty that Saul, who appears as a young and inexperienced youth in ch. ix, suddenly has a grown-up son in xiii–xiv. When these points are taken into consideration it seems probable that Jonathan's exploit is foreign to the earliest account of the defeat of the Philistines by Saul[3]. We have good reason to infer from the Book of Jashar that Jonathan on many an occasion distinguished himself valiantly, and this exploit of his was no doubt only one of many; we know that "there was sore war against the Philistines all the days of Saul."

[1] The verse begins: "After that thou shalt come to 'Gibeah of God,' where is the governor (?) of the Philistines, and let it come to pass when thou art come thither —" the remaining words are an introduction to x. 10-13.

[2] For an analogous example of such amplification, cp. 1 Kings xix. 15 sq. the charge given to Elijah to anoint Hazael and Jehu, which anticipates what really belonged to the career of Elisha.

[3] xiv. 23 *b*–30, 36–45 (46) betray the Saul who in his hour of victory was ready to sacrifice his son; tradition has sought to anticipate his attempt upon Jonathan's life (xx. 30–34). The episode requires the introductory note ver. 3, ver. 17 links Jonathan's exploit to the main narrative. The tradition gives effect to a popular feeling; Saul's vow (as H. P. Smith points out) was not ill-advised or arbitrary from the religious point of view. But the question is whether the deliverer of Israel freed the people in the manner described in xiv. 15–46, or whether later tradition has not obscured and expanded the original sequence of events.

As regards the freeing of Jabesh-Gilead from Nahash king of Ammon by Saul (xi. 1–11) it is held that originally Samuel found no place[1]. It has been remarked by others that this is the simplest and most natural account of Saul's rise, and the *naïve* introduction, x. 27 *b*, "and it came to pass after a month" (so LXX), is probably redactional. It has also been observed that it is by mere chance that the opportunity presented itself to Saul. Messengers were sent from Jabesh-Gilead throughout Israel, and when they reached "Gibeah of Saul" (proleptic) they made no inquiry for Saul, simply because they were not seeking him. The conjecture (above) that x. 3 sq. is to be associated with this, presupposes that, according to another tradition, Saul was on his way home, and met the men proceeding to Bethel. Both traditions have been modified, with the result that in xi. 4 the reader is expected to assume that the messengers were seeking the anointed king in the city which was to bear his name, and that in x. 3 sq. they had come to make him a present of bread and wine, apparently as a solemn offering or sacrificial feast.

The resemblance between the achievement in x, and some of the stories of the "Judges" is particularly striking; and had Saul lived in that period we should have expected him to become head or chief of Jabesh-Gilead. But if Saul is the last of the judges he is also the first of the kings, and we are now in a position to conclude that the oldest surviving traditions ascribed to Saul two great deeds—the freeing of Gilead, an event of local importance, and the defeat of the Philistines, an achievement which affected the very existence of Israel.

The belief that the Philistine oppression was subsequent to the defeat of Ammon, or was occasioned by Saul's attempt to establish a kingdom, is contrary to the tradition. Whatever may have been the true history of this early period, Saul, it was believed, owed his position to the fact that he was chosen by Yahweh to deliver Israel. The Philistines had long laid Israel under their yoke, and the people in their distress had cried unto Yahweh, and he had regarded their affliction (ix. 16). It may be objected that this represents a position of hopeless weakness which is not borne out by other passages[2], but it corresponds accurately with the older situation reflected in xiii–xiv. The most serious difficulty is to find an explanation of the invasion of the Philistines; all attempts to bring it into touch with preceding narratives being practically failures[3]. It is assumed that after the

[1] The mention of Judah, too, in ver. 8 is due to a gloss.

[2] e. g. ix. 1–14, where Saul wanders around the land accompanied only by one servant.

[3] Note that vii. 13 sq., the final subjugation of the Philistines, is late.

ark was brought to Kirjath-jearim a wave of oppression swept over the country, Shiloh was destroyed, and the power of Israel was broken; and it is observed that the establishment of a Philistine governor (or garrison) at Gibeah in Benjamin clearly indicates the extent of the Philistine supremacy. But this does not solve the problem. Jeremiah seems to speak of the fall of Shiloh as a comparatively recent event; and one Philistine governor or garrison is hardly enough to account for the oppression from which Israel is suffering (ix. 16). All the historians recognize the difficulty; and, unless one is prepared to assume that there is an unaccountable gap in the narratives, no effort must be spared to discover the prelude.

The events which chronologically precede Saul's deliverance of Israel from the Philistine yoke cannot be traced either in 1 Samuel or in the Appendix to the Book of Judges. Samson, it is true, is said to have *begun* to free Israel; but he was a Judaean or Danite hero, and his exploits would not affect Israel[1]. It is only when we reach the story of Jephthah and the introductory passage (x. 6–xii. 7) that we meet the required situation, and it seems justifiable to argue that the story of Saul's victories over Ammon and over the Philistines were once the immediate sequel to that extremely obscure introduction. The removal of all the narratives between Judg. xi and 1 Sam. ix will naturally strike the reader as exceedingly bold. As far as the *literary analysis* is concerned, it may be observed that Judges xvii–xxi is an appendix added to the book by one of the latest redactors, that the story of Samuel's youth has been written to form an introduction to the history of Eli and his sons, and that vii is of even later origin. For equally serious changes one may point to Num. x. 29, which resumes JE's narratives after Exod. xxxiv. 28, and to the insertion of the Elijah and Elisha narratives in 1–2 Kings. It need scarcely be said that the interpolated matter is not necessarily later than its new context. The *historical contents* of the intervening chapters in Judges and 1 Samuel will be considered later.

Judges x. 6–18 is an "Introduction to the History of the Oppression of Israel by the Ammonites and the Philistines" (G. F. Moore). It is a preface to a new oppression, and in its present form is extremely complicated. How much of it is Deuteronomic and how much belongs to an earlier writer (there are affinities with Joshua xxiv and 1 Sam. vii, xii) it is difficult to determine. It has references which as they stand are out of place, and allusions which it is impossible to trace in the immediately following story of Jephthah. The affinities with 1 Sam. vii are, in their turn, interesting, inasmuch

[1] Besides, Judges xiii. 5 *b* is probably a gloss.

as this chapter describes an overwhelming defeat of the Philistines which, on historical and literary grounds, has been rejected. Certainly, as regards the literary analysis, this abruptly introduced chapter (vii) finds no place in the older account of the history of Israel, but it is exceedingly improbable that it is wholly an invention. It seems to be a later story of the conclusion of the great oppression which Judges x. 6–18 introduces, and ascribes to Samuel, the theocratic ruler, what the older history ascribed to Saul. The narrative may or may not be based upon one of Saul's battles, but that it is deliberately intended to ignore Saul seems almost certain[1]. Even as the earlier Introduction to the Philistine and Ammonite oppression in Judges x. 6–18 finds its conclusion in Saul, so we may believe that the later hand who has worked upon it intended it to introduce his readers to that period of history which concluded with Samuel's victory at Eben-ezer. The later and the earlier redactions of the Introduction imply later and earlier narratives respectively. Apart from the literary affinities between the two which have been noticed by the commentators, it may be added that when mention is made of the "eighteen years'" oppression (Judges x. 8) one thinks of the "twenty years" that all the house of Israel lamented (?) after Yahweh (1 Sam. vii. 2), and when the climax is reached and the Introduction relates that the Israelites were assembled and encamped at Mizpah, one is at once reminded of Samuel's summons, "Gather all Israel to Mizpah" (1 Sam. vii. 5).

As regards the Ammonite oppression, it is tempting to suppose that Jephthah's defeat of the Ammonites was the occasion for Nahash's subsequent revenge. Jephthah was made chief of all the inhabitants of Gilead—possibly at Jabesh[2]—and that the children of Ammon meditated vengeance at the first opportunity is only to be expected. As regards the Philistine oppression, we note the interesting statement (Judges x. 8) that some foe crushed "all the Israelites who were across the Jordan in the land of the Amorites who were in Gilead." This can scarcely apply to the Ammonites who, curiously enough, are said to have made war on the west of the Jordan (contrast the position in Judges xi); but it is precisely the plight of the Israelites when Saul prepared to drive out the Philistines (1 Sam. xiii. 7). The words appear to be a trace of the oldest account which has been postulated in 1 Sam. xiii–xiv. Next, the penitent cry of the Israelites (Judges x. 10) and Yahweh's refusal to hear them culminates in fresh signs of

[1] Observe how even in 1 Sam. xiv we hear more of Jonathan than of Saul.

[2] Instead of כל ישבי גלעד, was it originally יבש גלעד (x. 18, xi. 8)? Cp. for a somewhat similar emendation 1 Kings xvii. 1.

penitence, "then they put away the foreign gods from among them, and served Yahweh, and he could bear the misery of Israel no longer" (vers. 13-16). The immediate sequel of this is wanting, but, as Moore remarks, it must have been followed by the raising up of the deliverer. Obviously we have a deliverer in Jephthah, but his is a local story; Gilead's misfortunes would scarcely account for the penitence of the people of Israel. But when we turn to the history of Saul it is impossible not to be struck by Yahweh's words to Samuel: "He shall save my people from the hand of the Philistines: for I have seen the affliction of my people, for their cry is come unto me" (1 Sam. ix. 16)[1]. Many obscure points still remain, but if the attempt is to be made to discover the background to this Introduction it may perhaps be enough to indicate what seems to have been the true sequence. One may not hope to recover all the threads of the original story; only here and there may an occasional hint be gleaned from the narrative.

The composite character of the stories of Gideon, Abimelech, and Jephthah would indicate that the work of criticism has not ceased when we recover what is supposed to have been the earlier form of the Saul-narratives. Three stages appear to be required, and only two at present have been considered. Now (1) in seeking for the *raison d'être* of the elaborate religious Introduction (Judges x), which is quite inapplicable to the story of Jephthah, it is held that we have here a preface to the period closing with 1 Sam. vii. Both, in their present form, are late, and the latter is unhistorical. (2) The late redaction of Judges x, taken with the late account of the overthrow of the Philistines in 1 Sam. vii, suggests that the Introduction in an earlier form is the prelude to some older and more historical narrative, and it is argued that the latter can only be the story of Saul. Lastly (3), at a still earlier date we may assume that the religious element was wanting, or at least less pronounced. One may compare the old story of Gideon with its additions (e.g. Judges vi. 25 sqq.), and to the twofold narratives of the exploits of Gideon and Jephthah we may find a parallel in Saul's victory (*a*) over Ammon, and (*b*) over the Philistines. The fact that Saul's successes led to the establishment of a monarchy will explain the repeated redaction which the original account of this important event has received, and will make it intelligible why in the second stage the figure of Samuel begins to attain prominence. It is suspected that Samuel once found no place in the story of Saul's rise, and this appears fairly obvious in the case of 1 Sam. xi. It is singular that in the account of the Midianite op-

[1] With the statement that the people were in straits (Judges x. 9) cp. 1 Sam. xiii. 6.

pression (Judges vi. 7*b*-10), a prophet suddenly springs up from nowhere to call the people to remember the great deeds which Yahweh did for them; denunciation and subsequent penitence are wanting, and the man of God disappears as suddenly as he came. Such a passage may once have stood in Judges x, since at some point in the development of the narrative a Samuel would certainly have been introduced to the reader. With the subsequent dislocation and redaction the figure was removed; but it is perhaps correct to believe that in the process the opportunity was taken to use his words, with necessary modification, in the opening part of the story of Gideon. The growth of the tradition between the stages is apparent from the chapters which now intervene between the Introduction and the life of Saul. Theory divided the history of Israel into a series of epoch-making ages, and at each epoch (e. g. the exodus, conquest, the era of the Judges, the monarchy), the narratives betray a strong theological colouring representing the successive steps in the development of national tradition and religious thought. So the figure of Samuel increases in grandeur until he overtops Saul, and becomes, through Yahweh, practically the founder of the monarchy. Saul is no longer the "judge" who established his might by force of arms or earned the submission of a people by warlike success; the idea of a monarchy is resented, the priesthood typified by Samuel are opposed to the innovation, and Saul, if he is a monarch, is second to this high-priest. As for the narratives which have found a place between the dates represented by the ultimate and penultimate stage, it will be recognized that the story of a Samson, even if he lived at the age of the Judges, has no literary connexion with its present context. The appendix to the Judges appears to belong to a cycle with which the story of Eli and the ark is associated, and, it will be argued subsequently, does not belong to this period. Finally, with the life of Eli is interwoven the story of the youth of Samuel, and here it will be enough for the present to quote Prof. Kent's words (Israel's *Historical and Biographical Narratives*, p. 51):—

"Tradition rarely begins with the childhood of the heroes. Jacob, Moses, and Samuel are the conspicuous Old Testament exceptions. Furthermore, stories regarding the childhood of a great man in antiquity were not appreciated, and therefore not recounted until long after he had ceased to live. In their origin they are, therefore, usually much later than those which record his life-work."

The rest of the history of Saul, as we have already observed, generally presents him in an unfavourable light. From xvi onwards it is the aim of tradition to exalt and magnify David's bravery and nobility, and to depreciate the character of Saul. The literary

analysis is admitted to be exceedingly complicated, and illustrates the gradual growth of the stories which subsequent generations loved to tell of the first great king over all Israel. But in spite of their complexity it is not easy to ignore the belief that, so far as Saul is concerned, the narratives offer popular stories rather than plain history. How utterly we are at the mercy of the writers whose only care was to preserve what interested *them* is evident from the lacunae, the puzzling gaps which the Books of Samuel do not allow us to fill up. The mysterious destruction of Shiloh, and the remarkable appearance of the priestly families at Nob, and of the guild of prophets at Naioth, are problems that evade solution unless more rigorous criticism be applied. The casual allusion to Saul's dealings with the Gibeonites (2 Sam. xxi. 2) remains one of the many puzzles of early Hebrew history, although if Nob be a corruption of Gibeon[1] the ground is partly cleared. If commentators have not failed to refer to Joshua ix, may one not go a step further, and call to mind the suggestion that Joshua's southern campaign has for its historical basis Saul's defeat of the Philistines? Now this campaign is so closely associated with Joshua's covenant with the men of Gibeon that it is perhaps not too hazardous to conjecture that Saul's great victory was, in like manner, brought into connexion with the Gibeonites. I merely note the coincidence, and would emphasize one important difference between the two narratives. Saul, according to 2 Sam. xxi. 2, had shed blood, and had thereby incurred blood-revenge; whereas Joshua delivered the men out of the hand of the children of Israel (Joshua ix. 26), which is a clear sign that this narrative could have told us more of the hostility of Israel had later editors left it intact. Again, it is perhaps only a coincidence, but the conclusion of Joshua's great fight with the *five* kings of the south[2], and their slaughter, at once recalls Saul's defeat of the Amalekites and the sacrificial slaying of Agag. 1 Sam. xv is one of the most obscure narratives in the whole of Saul's life, and, as H. P. Smith has shown, "the character and position of Samuel as here portrayed agree closely with his picture as drawn in the life of Samuel, chapters vii, viii, and xii." How far it is historical is extremely uncertain; it can scarcely be rejected entirely; and the analogy of ch. vii alone is sufficient to warrant the conviction that a certain amount of truth underlies it. In both some historical incident has been worked up to serve a specified purpose. There is scarcely room for a defeat of the Amalekites so soon before David's victory, and they are unfortunately just the people whom it is difficult

[1] *Encyc. Bib.*, col. 3430.

[2] We may bear in mind the *five* tyrants of the Philistines.

to fix, owing to the conflicting statements in the Old Testament. The story is not wholly unfavourable to Saul. He is represented as the Lord's anointed, commissioned to take vengeance upon Amalek. The scene of the campaign agrees with 1 Sam. xxvii. 8, the motive with David's victory in xxx. 26, and the consideration which Saul shows for the Kenites is quite in harmony with the character of a king who built altars to Yahweh, and whose son Jonathan bears a name which gives expression to his religious belief. The narrator represents Samuel as a more autocratic being than even Elijah or Elisha, and, in view of the relative lateness of the chapter, the statement that Saul appears to be king over Judah need not be taken as correct. The age of Elisha is the one conspicuous early period where the prophets could make and unmake kings; and it does not seem far-fetched to suppose that among the prophetic guilds which flourished at that time there were many who believed that their political power extended back to the days of the first king of Israel. And this being so, the allusion to the Kenites (xv. 6) may not be quite meaningless: for if Jehu was indebted to Elisha, he was no less under the influence of Jehonadab the Rechabite; and if 1 Chron. ii. 55 is to be trusted, the Rechabites were related to the Kenites. More suggestive than this, moreover, is the fact (loc. cit.) that these were related to "the families of scribes," whose care it would be to put in writing the traditional history of their land. This highly interesting statement is surely of some importance for the history of the Israelites.

1 Sam. xv and xiii. 8–14 (an episode in the Philistine war) are stories of Saul's rejection, and this may be viewed as a slight support for the connexion (which has been hazarded above) between the slaying of Agag by Saul and of the five South Palestinian kings by Joshua. But the links are so slight that at the most a confusion of traditions in the oral, not in the literary stage, can only be postulated. On the other hand, the reference to Carmel (xv. 12) raises the question whether Samuel (like Elijah and Elisha) may not have been associated here, not with the unimportant town in the neighbourhood of Hebron, but with the more famous mountain not far remote from the closing incidents in Saul's life.

It is to be feared that it is a matter of no little difficulty sometimes to comprehend Saul's position in Gibeah, living as he was in constant danger of invasion by the Philistines. He had war against them all his lifetime (xiv. 52), and ever and again they invaded his territory, once, so the story went, to the manifest advantage of David (xxiii. 27). Retaliatory raids were made, but it is noteworthy that throughout the whole cycle of the Saul-David narratives the scene is placed in Judah and Benjamin. In connexion with this, it is to be noticed

that as the narratives proceed, Saul and David drift further and further apart, until finally in 1 Sam. xxx we have a selection from an independent story of David, whilst xxviii. 3–25, xxxi give us an equally independent story of Saul. It is here that we find David gradually strengthening his position among the elders south of Hebron, whilst Saul appears to be quite naturally located in the plain of Jezreel. Read in the light of the narratives which precede, we are to understand that on this occasion, when Saul fights his last fight against the Philistines, the king leaves Gibeah for Gilboa, and the five tyrants march northwards from their cities in order to encamp at Jezreel. Must it not be admitted that the narratives as they stand present a new difficulty? We may read between the lines, and we may assume that Saul had moved to a fresh capital; in fact, half a dozen conjectures or assumptions could be made. The historians seem to find no difficulty in the sudden shifting of the scene, or if they find it, it is ignored. Now, in the previous section reference was made to the results of Budde's investigations on the literary character of the closing chapters in 1 Samuel[1]. According to this scholar, xxvii, xxviii. 1, 2, xxix–xxxi are Judaean; in David's life as an outlaw, apart from a few Ephraimite passages, the Judaean element predominates, whilst in the history of David at the court of Saul the source is almost wholly Ephraimite. These results sufficiently indicate in a general way the character of the chapters as a whole. The oldest source appears most distinctly at the close of 1 Samuel, where, as we have just seen, the lives of David and Saul are presented separately. To this same source Budde (it will be noticed) ascribes also xxvii and xxix, and it is precisely the latter chapter which links together the two lives. But however closely ch. xxix may be proved to be connected with its context, it is none the less embarrassing, and introduces a fresh difficulty. It is strange that David's presence was not discovered until the Philistines reached Aphek; and although David has been living under the care of Achish for some time, it only now occurs to them that this is the renowned hero of Saul's previous triumphs. The Philistine confederation was too united for us to assume that the four lords were ignorant that the fifth had had the renowned David as a vassal living at Ziklag; and if the Philistine army was large enough to inflict a crushing defeat upon Saul, and to occupy the Israelite cities, David and his six hundred men (xxx. 10) would scarcely be sufficient to turn the tide in favour of Israel.

It would certainly seem that the separate stories of Saul and David stand on a different footing, and are more trustworthy compared with those wherein their fortunes are mingled with one another

[1] *J. Q. R.*, XVII, p. 787 sq.

or with that great forerunner of the prophetic guilds — Samuel. A similar conclusion seemed to be reached from our study of 2 Samuel, where those narratives which presupposed an intimate relation between David and Saul's house did not appear to be from the same source as the other records of David's life. One is inclined to assume that we have a cycle of local traditions centring around Bethlehem and Benjamin. Comparative history affords many parallels.

But here we must take leave of Saul for the present. If the criticism has been destructive, it has at least brought into prominence the heroic and devout figure whose achievements move us more deeply than the pettiness of character[1] which looms so large through many of the apparently less authentic narratives. If we can but dimly grasp the personality of this king, we cannot, at all events, feel sufficiently grateful that the triumphant ode from the Book of Jashar has been preserved to tell us how his memory was cherished. And if a few scattered indications have been correctly interpreted, it is no slight gain to believe that Saul became the "Joshua" of the northern Hebrews (Joshua x), even as we may suspect that David was the "Joshua" of the southern (Joshua xi).

We cannot too strongly emphasize the fact that we have only what the historians, or rather, the editors, have chosen to give us. It is only by a comparative study of one king with the other, or by the welcome discovery of independent evidence, that we can comprehend the greatness of an Omri or a Jeroboam II. We know too well how apt history is to sum up the character and reign of past monarchs in a single epithet; we know also how later ages are wont to ascribe to treasured heroes of the past the legends and traditions that have grown up since their death. Allowance has to be made in two directions therefore; and as a "bloody" Queen Mary suffers in comparison with a "good" Queen Bess, so may we not feel that the Old Testament narratives, with their obvious interest for the ideal king David and for Samuel, the prototype of prophetic power, have left little room for Saul to play his part? In this early period with which we are dealing, the *quality* of the material must always be the first object of criticism. But the *quantity* must also be carefully observed; and, on reflection, it may perhaps appear extremely remarkable that we should ever possess so full and varied an account of the times of Samuel and David, whereas for the history of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah our sources are relatively meagre, and,

[1] That this weakness and lack of virility in the Saul-David narratives has some foundation may, however, follow from a consideration of the strain of weakness which marked Saul's descendants. Neither Ishbaal nor Meribaal is represented as a sturdy or even as a pleasing figure.

with only a few brilliant exceptions, are treated from one and the same religious point of view. Of the exceptions, the most notable are the narratives relating to Solomon, and those which are woven around Elijah and Elisha. It is perhaps only a coincidence that these are associated respectively with the ideal monarchy and with the predominance of the prophets, and thus suggest the names of David and Samuel. This leads to the study of Samuel's life, and a comparison with Elijah and Elisha; and the question will arise whether the situations represented in even the older stories of Samuel naturally belong to the period covered by the close of the Judges and the institution of a Monarchy.

III. Judges x. 6—1 Samuel viii.

In the preceding section reference was made to the passage, Judges x. 6 sqq., which is not merely an Introduction to the story of Jephthah, but, by its inclusion of the Philistines (ver. 6 sq.), evidently has in view, also, the Philistine oppression in the days of Eli and Samuel. It commences a period of history which closes with the institution of the Monarchy, and the suggestion was made that in an earlier form it was immediately followed by the account of Saul's defeat of the Philistines and the Ammonites (1 Sam. xi, xiii sq.). The chapters which intervene comprise: (*a*) an account of the exploits of Samson (Judges xiii-xvi), (*b*) an Appendix to the book of Judges (xvii-xxi), and (*c*) narratives dealing with Eli, the guardian of the ark, and Samuel. Of these, the first affects Judah alone: Samson's deeds are neither the sequel to Jephthah's life nor are they the prelude to the work of Eli. Certain features (e.g. the Nazirite vow, family of Moses, mention of the Philistines and Danites) associate this cycle with the chapters that follow, but it must be recognized that, in spite of their extreme interest as examples of popular literature, they can scarcely claim to be considered as historical documents. The Appendix differs markedly from the rest of the book; it does not describe the exploits of any judge, but relates two incidents which were attributed to this age. The literary evidence suggests that it is a later addition to the book. The signs of Deuteronomic redaction which characterize the stories of the judges (ii. 6-xvi. 31) are wanting, and although this does not preclude the possibility that the chapters go back to an old source, the conclusion which the literary phenomena suggest must not be overlooked. Finally, in 1 Sam. i sqq., the whole account of the part played by Samuel must be treated with the greatest care. By the side of the older narratives which tell how Saul delivered the people from their enemies and thence became king, there are chapters which represent a tradition which can only have arisen long after these events occurred. Here we find Samuel, the theocratic head of the people, wielding an authority which makes the institution of a monarchy practically unnecessary. The desire of the people for a king is now regarded as an act of apostasy. That the age demanded a leader,

and that Yahweh himself had selected the man whom Samuel was to anoint, is ignored. To quote from Prof. Kent[1]:—

"Very different were the traditions cherished by the later prophets. The figure of an Elijah, an Elisha, or an Isaiah dictating in the name of Jehovah to king and people was on the one hand prominently before them. On the other, the evils of the kingship, as exemplified in the despotic, luxurious and—to their enlightened point of view—apostate reigns of such kings as Solomon and Ahab, were uppermost in their minds. To them the kingship seemed a step not forward from anarchy and oppression, as it actually was, but backward from that ideal theocracy which their imagination had unconsciously projected on the canvas of their early past. All Israel was conceived of as enjoying the benign guidance of the great prophet-judge, Samuel."

To this representation of history belong 1 Sam. viii, x. 17–25, xii, xv, and xxviii. 3–25, and there is little doubt that there are other passages wherein the tendency to idealize Samuel can already be discerned. That chapter vii, Samuel's great victory over the Philistines, is unhistorical, and appears to be based upon Saul's exploit—which it anticipates—has already been observed, and the entire account of the prophet's birth and consecration has all the appearance of having been superimposed upon the earlier and more trustworthy story of Eli[2]. There is, in fact, much in favour of Prof. H. P. Smith's arguments that the history of Eli and the ark (1 Sam. ii. 12–17, 22–25, 27 sqq., iv. 1–vii. 1) belongs to a distinct narrative which a writer of the life of Samuel has subordinated to his more interesting theme, and this theory will be found to explain both the unexpected omission of the commencement of Eli's life and the failure to narrate the subsequent fortunes of Shiloh and the ark after the return of the latter to Kirjath-jearim.

Whatever may be its historical foundation, the figure of Samuel as it has come down to us is largely the result of later tradition which has read into this great prototype the authority and power of the prophetical figures of subsequent ages. The recognition of this will explain the marked divergences in the narratives. As a legislative

[1] *Israel's Historical and Biographic Narratives* (London, 1905), p. 65; cp. H. P. Smith, *Samuel*, p. xvi; Driver, *Literature of the Old Testament*, pp. 165 sq., &c.

[2] Kent, p. 51 (see above, p. 27). In like manner, the story of Samson's birth (Judges xiii) appears to be later than the account of his exploits. Verse 5 represents him as a forerunner of Samuel and Saul, and the chapter gives a different view of the hero of the folk-tales in whose deeds religion or religious motives are lacking.

"judge" his sphere of action is confined to Bethel, Gilgal, Mizpah, and Ramah (vii. 16 sq.), scarcely an extensive district for the theocratic figure which viii, xii, and xv presuppose. Tradition believed that his sons, like those of Eli, were the cause of the people's complaint (viii. 5), but this is not supported by viii. 20 or xii. 12 (see also ver. 2). The narratives into which Samuel enters constitute the most important source for the history of early Israelite history. The old seer stands out like an Elijah or Elisha, and a comparative study of the three only strengthens the impression that tradition has ascribed to Saul's age the prophetic energy which was in full evidence several generations later. It is not until a later age that we again meet with the prophetic guilds of Mt. Ephraim, with seats at Bethel, Jericho, and Gilgal, and it is a striking circumstance that these places are approximately the district associated with Samuel's activity, and that a guild of prophets is specifically mentioned at the unknown Naioth[1]. Magic personalities (e.g. the witch at Endor), the conflicts with monarchy, the existence of a special class of *nĕbî'îm*, the sporadic occurrence of the Nazirite vow—even the employment of music to excite the ecstatic condition, combine to form a picture which points forcibly to a period of an Elijah or Elisha. We cannot doubt that the prophetic associations of that later age had their own traditions, and that they should throw back their history to pre-monarchic days is scarcely a matter for surprise. Benjamin, as we know, became the religious centre of the land, but may we feel sure that it had already obtained this distinction by Saul's time? Accordingly, instead of assuming that these characteristic features of pre-prophetism died out and were revived later in the days of Elijah, or that the silence of the intervening period is accidental, and due to the fragmentary or incomplete character of the narratives which have survived[2], we may have to conclude that the narratives with which we have been dealing are not to be regarded as evidence either for the religion or for the history of Israel in pre-monarchic days.

The older chapters containing the account of Eli and the ark are among the most valued of records for the early conceptions of the attributes of that sacred object. We are introduced to the sanctuary of Shiloh where the aged priest is no longer able to restrain the

[1] 1 Sam. xix. 18–24. The name perhaps suggests a pastoral encampment, and in spite of its obscurity it is interesting to note that the early prophetism was opposed to civilization, and that the Rechabites were distinguished for their tent-life and general retention of the nomadic ideal.

[2] W. R. Harper, *Amos and Hosea*, pp. l–li.

rapacity of his sons. With unusual detail their wickedness is exposed, and a passage (which may be a later insertion) proclaims the punishment that shall befall the priest and his house. Philistine aggression drove the people to arms, and when a defeat led the elders to bring into the field of battle the all-powerful Ark of Yahweh, this appeared to have lost its power, and was captured by the enemy. But no sooner was it in the hands of the Philistines than it showed its former superiority, until in despair they prepared to return it unto its rightful possessors. A further exhibition of its power at Beth-shemesh resulted in its being taken to Kirjath-jearim, and there it remained until the days of David. The notice in 1 Sam. ii. 27 sq. makes it certain that in the mind of the writer Eli belonged to the Levites who were elected to the priesthood. The priests of Shiloh were accordingly descended from those to whom Yahweh revealed himself "when they were in Egypt, servants to Pharaoh's house." Now, in the first of the two stories appended to the book of Judges, we hear of a migration of the Danites, of the founding and sacking of some unnamed sanctuary of Mt. Ephraim, and of the establishment of a priesthood at Dan under a grandson of Moses. This continued, it is said, "as long as the house of God was at Shiloh" (xviii. 31). In addition to this reference, there is one especially important passage which requires notice at this juncture. In Num. x. 29–36 there is an account of the departure of the ark; Moses invites Hobab to accompany him, and notwithstanding the refusal as reported, it subsequently appears from Judges i. 16, iv. 11 that a clan of the Kenites or Midianites finally settled in Judah. Commentators have not failed to notice that the attributes of the ark described in Num. loc. cit. find a parallel in the chapters of 1 Sam. under consideration, and one is tempted to believe that the three narratives in question belong to one and the same cycle of traditions. It is true that in the second story of the Appendix, the leading figure is a Levite and Shiloh itself enters somewhat prominently, but the character of the evidence does not appear to allow us to incorporate Judges xix–xxi also in the same series.

It might be conjectured that an old account of the foundation of Shiloh once stood before the story of Eli, and if this were the case, it is intelligible that it would naturally be omitted to avoid the contradiction with the later tradition in the Book of Joshua which would result. As far as the literary evidence is concerned it has to be noticed that the composite story of the migration of the Danites shows comparatively little trace of a post-exilic hand (Judges xvii. 6, xviii. 1, &c.), whereas the narrative of the outrage at Gibeah and the extermination of Benjamin in ch. xx sq. has been considerably re-

cast. There is a possibility, therefore, that the latter was added later, even as it would seem that the story of Ruth was not utilized until a time when it was too late to place it in the literature of the period to which it was ascribed. This assumption would enable us to point to the existence of two distinct series of narratives comprising (*a*) the older portions of Judges xvii sq. (and of xix-xxi ?), (*b*) the story of Eli and of the ark, and to conclude that to (*a*) has been prefixed a cycle of stories relating to a Danite hero, and that with (*b*) has been combined the story of Samuel's youth, thus filling up the period between Jephthah and Saul.

The narratives of Eli and the ark are of a unique type. Not only do we find that the ark has been silently established at Shiloh, but Shiloh has become the centre of worship. It is the seat of a legiti mate priesthood whose corruption leads to its undoing. For its sins it falls; it disappears from the pages of history as suddenly as it appears; and, like an oasis in the midst of a desert, presents a striking picture of internal religious life in a period which is placed after the unsettled conditions under the judges and before the rise of Saul. It is, moreover, a period in which the Philistines have been enjoying the upper hand (1 Sam. iv. 9), when conflicts between them and the Israelites were frequent, and when the trend of history would have scarcely prepared us to expect the circumstances which the narratives relate and the conditions they reflect.

What is narrated of the fortunes of the ark among the Philistines seems to belong to some definite nucleus of traditions. Chs. v, vi are intimately associated with iv (the loss of the ark), and it has been assumed that the great defeat of the Hebrews which is implied by the story prepares one for the conditions when Saul arose. We are therefore to suppose that although the Philistines were moved by the power of the ark to the extent that they sent it back to the Israelites, they did not relax their oppressions, and that the lesson which the ark had taught them passed unheeded. But how comes it that the ark which had thus shown its supernatural power suddenly ceased to become the palladium of the tribes? For the character of the ark these chapters are of the utmost value; for its history they raise unanswerable questions. It is not until David's time that it reappears; Saul makes no effort to recover it; Samuel (whose youth had been spent in its shadow) takes no further thought of it. In 1 Sam. the ark takes up its quarters at Kirjath-jearim in the house of Abinadab, and only comes to light again after David had succeeded in taking Jerusalem. Here it is found at Baal-Judah, and after an incident at the threshing-floor of Nachon and a temporary sojourn at the house of Obed-edom it is brought into Jerusalem accompanied by every sign of rejoicing and gladness.

The serious difficulties which these narratives contain have given rise to theories which need not be discussed[1]. David's unrestrained enthusiasm at the successful entry of the ark is not without its significance. That it remained in the house of an Obed-edom is suggestive also. Late passages (Joshua xv. 2–11, 1 Chron. xiii. 6), but *not* 2 Sam. vi. 2, identify Kirjath-jearim with Baal-Judah, but there was a Baalah in the south of Judah and a Baalath-beer in the same district; on the other hand, this name is admittedly not confined to the south. When we inquire what light is thrown upon the problem by the earlier history, we have to note first the passage in Num. x. 29–36, to which reference has already been made, where the ark is associated with the journey of the Israelites to Hobab. Another old passage (Deut. x. 8) supports the view that is was borne by the Levites. To presume to fight without the sacred ark was to invite defeat, and on one notable occasion the people brought defeat upon themselves by their foolhardiness (Num. xiv. 44 sq.). But there is a curious gap here to which we must return immediately. It is true that we subsequently meet with the ark at the crossing of the Jordan and at the fall of Jericho (Joshua iii. sq., vi. sq.), but it is unaccountably missing in stories of greater national moment. It is not until the abrupt appearance of the priesthood at Shiloh that it is found again, and finally it is only after another strange silence that David brings it up into Jerusalem with every manifestation of relief.

The account of the defeat in Num. xiv. 41–45 is particularly perplexing. The people were at Kadesh (xiii. 26), and terrified at the report of the spies, planned to return to Egypt. For their unbelief they were punished, and it was decreed that they should wander in the wilderness[2]. Caleb alone was an exception, and for his faith he and his seed were rewarded with the blessing (xiv. 24). North of Kadesh, at a mountain (?in the hill-country), an attempt was made to push into Canaan, but the people were smitten down. Hormah, which is here mentioned, appears elsewhere as the name given to Arad after its capture by the Israelites (xxi. 1–3), whilst in Judges i. 16 sq. it is the name given to Zephath, which Judah and Simeon smote. In the latter passage we meet with the Kenites (ver. 16), and other traditions associate the conquest of the district with the clan Caleb. Thus, Caleb takes Hebron and his brother seizes Kirjath-sepher (Joshua xv. 14–19), whilst elsewhere (Joshua xiv. 6–15) Caleb reminds Joshua of the promise made at Kadesh and asks

[1] Kosters, *Theol. Tijd.* xxvii, 361 sqq.; Cheyne, *Encyc. Bib.*, s. v. "Ark."

[2] The details of the different views embodied in J, E, &c. need not be more specifically noticed at this stage.

that he may have the "*mountain* whereof Yahweh spoke" and hopes that he may be able to drive out the giants from its midst. The interest manifested in this clan has surely some significance, and it is not too much to infer that there are distinct traces of what might be called a "Calebite" tradition in the Old Testament. Who, save a Calebite, would write that Yahweh promised to Caleb and his seed the possession of the land? Subsequently, we shall see that Caleb is only one of several closely related clans of the south of Palestine, of the same general stock as the Edomites[1], and if the genealogical lists have any value at all it follows that to these southerners Moses' kin and the Kenites undoubtedly belonged. Further, it is irresistible to avoid the conclusion which several critics have reached, that after the events at Kadesh some clans actually succeeded in making their way into Judah, and we can readily understand that when these became incorporated with the Israelites, their traditions underwent serious modification. Hence it is intelligible why Caleb should have been enrolled in the genealogy of Judah, and why it is Judah who gives Hebron and Kirjath-sepher to Caleb (Judges i. 10–15, 20); also, why it is Joshua who apportions to Caleb his lot and blesses him (Joshua xiv. 6–15), and why the occupation of Palestine is regarded as the effect of the movements of the tribes from Gilgal (Judges i–ii. 1).

The oldest traditions begin with the commencement of the journey of the ark with tribes related to Moses (Kenites, Calebites, &c.), and they conclude with its triumphal entry under David (2 Sam. vi). Was the ark the portable shrine which these tribes took with them to Jerusalem, even as the Danites were content to take a Levite priest and an ephod in their march upon Laish? Was it taken by David from some South-Judean Baal, and thence after a three-months' residence with Obed-edom[2], conveyed to the capital? If the scattered indications have any value for this theory, it is evident that some light is thrown upon the traditions of Eli and the ark. It has been remarked that Eli himself was descended from the Levites, and the scribal families were of the Kenites and Calebites of whose cities Kirjath-jearim (1 Sam. vii. 1) was one. Furthermore, tradition knew of a Joshua of Beth-shemesh ("house of the sun"), the inhabitants of which rejoiced to see the ark. The place lay on the borders of Judah and Dan, opposite Zorah; and the name recalls Heres ("sun" Judges i. 35), but its relation to Timnath-heres (the tomb of Joshua) can only be a matter of conjecture.

[1] Cp. Caleb son of Kenaz, and see Gen. xxxvi. 11, 15, 42.

[2] It is only the Chronicler who makes him a Levite, but that the tradition rests upon a sound basis will be argued later.

The story of the migration of the Danites is familiar and need not be recapitulated. The tribesmen had their seats at Zorah and Eshtaol, and Mahaneh-Dan (perhaps rather Manahath-Dan) seems to preserve some tradition of their presence. The first two places are elsewhere Judaean, and all three names are associated with the Calebites[1]. This is important, not only because of the contiguity of the district with Judah's territory, but also on account of the prominence of the Calebite tradition elsewhere in this cycle of narratives. At the period when the story opens the Danites had no landed possession. Five men, representatives of the clans, were sent out to seek a suitable district, and from the gloss in Judges xviii. 1, we may infer that the only territory not already held by Israel and not too powerful to withstand them lay in the north. Laish in the neighbourhood of Beth-Rehob was found to be free from interference on the part of Phoenicians[2], and thither in due course six hundred fighting men and their households proceeded. Previously, the five Danites had passed by the sanctuary of Micah the Ephraimite, and had found that the Levite of Bethlehem, who was installed there, was no stranger to them. It is made quite clear that they recognized his voice (so one version), and that they were entitled to ask for an explanation of his presence. The narrative does not explain why this Levite should be known to the Danites, and were it not for the information supplied by the genealogies in 1 Chron. ii. 50 sq. (see below note 1), the question probably could not be answered; but it is possible that the statistical information referred to supplies an obvious clue, and that an intimate relation between Levites of Bethlehem and Danites was intelligible to those who recounted this story[3]. It is therefore significant that these Danites should request this Levite to consult the divine oracle on their behalf, and that subsequently they should carry off to their new home the priest and the sacred objects which he tended.

The story is one that might well appear to be fit to belong only to the pre-monarchic period, although there is evidence enough that the

[1] The genealogies in 1 Chron. ii. 50 sq. are now usually regarded as post-exilic, but the view is not an easy one. They include among the "sons" of Salma (the "father of Bethlehem") half the Manahathites and the Zorites. The Zorathites and Eshtaolites are connected with the families of Kirjath-jearim whose "father" Shobal is a son of Caleb, and the entire body appears to have been akin to a branch (at least) of the Kenites, and to have numbered among them families of scribes.

[2] And Aramaeans—if we may read ארם for אדם in xviii. 7.

[3] It may be noted incidentally that the Levite of Mt. Ephraim in Judges xix when he takes a concubine has one from Beth-lehem.

morality of the proceedings is not characteristic of this age alone. Hosea's scathing denunciations are sufficient to show that bloodshed and rapine were common enough in his days, even among the priests, and it seems open to question whether the Danite migration as described in Judges xvii, xviii really belongs to the particular period to which an editor of the Book of Judges has ascribed it. Do the facts, the conditions implied, and the character of the narrative, as a whole point to a date somewhere after the time of Jephthah and Samson and previous to the days of Saul?

The new home of the Danites[1], in David's time, was a minor Aramaean state (2 Sam. x. 6, 8), mentioned together with Zobah, Maacah (cp. Abel-beth-Maacah) and Tob, and situated apparently to the north of Lake Ḥuleh. We know something of this locality, also, from the story of Joshua's fight with the king of Hazor and his allies (Joshua xi). Read in connexion with one of the two events now combined in Judges iv, it would seem that the tribes (possibly only Issachar and Zebulun) overthrew the northern confederation at the "waters of Merom" and scattered their opponents to Sidon on the west and the valley of Mizpeh on the east. The scene of the defeat appears to have been beyond Lake Ḥuleh, and the "waters of Merom" (cp. "waters" of Megiddo, Jericho, &c.) probably denote some small stream[2]. It is not unlikely that Joshua's great battle in the north is a reflection of a victory gained by David, even as his conquest in the south appears to have been derived from a recollection of one of Saul's achievements. It does not seem plausible to suppose that David conquered a district which had been Israelite and then reconquered by a Hadad-ezer, nor is it likely that the Danites after their migration were swallowed up and became part of an Aramaean state. On the other hand, it may not have been until after David's conquest that there was an opportunity for a tribe to settle in a locality which had become tranquil and peaceful, "secure and unsuspicious of danger"[3].

Some of the prominent features of the preceding narratives may now be summarized. In the story of the Danite migration we are in

[1] Laish in the plain belonging to Beth-rehob (Judges xviii. 28).

[2] See *Encyc. Bib.*, s. v. "Merom."

[3] From 2 Sam. xx. 18 (LXX, see Driver, Budde, &c.), it appears that Abel-beth-Maacah and Dan became places famous for the retention of genuine Israelite life. This is improbable, whether we believe that David overcame the Aramaeans of Maacah early or late in his reign (2 Sam. x), but on other grounds it has been argued that the conclusion of Sheba's revolt is due to redaction, and this would remove the present difficulty; see *Amer. Journ. of Sem. Lang.*, 1900, pp. 166 sqq.

a period where the Levites are journeying through Israel to find homes and the Danites themselves are leaving Zorah and Eshtaol for a district in North Israel which probably first became Israelite under David. The sanctuaries at Mt. Ephraim and Dan are possibly regarded with some contempt in so far as the proceeds of stolen property in the one case, and despoiled sacred objects in the other, constitute their origin. In the early chapters in 1 Samuel we have already noticed the sudden appearance of the priesthood of Eli at Shiloh and its equally sudden disappearance. Both Shiloh and Dan were destroyed at the same time (Judges xviii. 31), and Jeremiah's references to the fate of the former (Jer. vii. 12, 14) seem to point to a recent disaster. The same prophet evidently regarded the ark of the covenant as an object of little consequence (iii. 16), although in the course of the growth of tradition the importance of the ark increased. In one of the earliest writings we find it associated with a movement northwards, presumably from Kadesh, and from other evidence it would seem that the result of this journey is to be found in the presence of certain closely-related clans which were subsequently incorporated with Judah. The historical difficulties which are raised by the narratives of the ark in 1 Sam. iv–vi have been mentioned; on the other hand, the tradition embodied in 2 Sam. vi appears to furnish an appropriate conclusion to the history of its migration. Originally the ark was, perhaps, exclusively Judaean, and the contemptuous attitude of Saul's daughter (2 Sam. vi. 16 sqq.) may suggest that it was a strange object to a Benjamite. The passage is certainly obscure, but it is at least unnecessary to suppose that Michal was unaccustomed to exhibitions of religious fervour; probably it was not the form of the cult but the object of it which is to be regarded as the cause of her displeasure.

At this stage we encounter a difficulty which has to be faced, whatever be the point of view from which the history of the Old Testament is studied. The stories of the "Judges" are chiefly concerned with Central Palestine, and Judah and Benjamin enter only slightly into the history of the period. In Judges xvii sq., however, we meet with a Levite from Bethlehem whilst Danites are associated with Zorah and Eshtaol and encamp at Kirjath-jearim. In xix. sqq. a Levite has taken a concubine from Bethlehem, and although Jerusalem is (probably by an archaism) regarded as Jebusite, Gibeah is in the hands of the Benjamites. Again, in 1 Sam. iv there are Israelites at Beth-shemesh and Kirjath-jearim, and the extent to which the district in general enters into the history of Saul need not be recapitulated. Now, from other sources we gain the following important facts: Jebus (Jerusalem) was a strong fortress which was first taken by

David, and there is no reason to suppose that it stood alone. Estates in its neighbourhood were given to David's sons and officers (Joab, Abiathar) and one may regard Jerusalem as the centre of "Jebusite" power. Elsewhere, we learn that Gezer, Mt. Heres, Aijalon and Shaalbim were not Israelite (Judges i. 29, 35), and that Gibeon, Chephirah, Beeroth and Kirjath-jearim formed a confederation of their own (Joshua ix. 17). These places formed a series of independent towns stretching east and west, and until they were taken by the Israelites national union was impossible. The early history of Israel must have been largely determined by these conditions, and it is perhaps too readily assumed that the tradition which they represent is applicable only to the age of the "Judges." We know that Saul entered into a treaty with the Gibeonites, but even David respected their independence, and if the story relates that they became slaves to the "house of Yahweh" (Joshua ix. 27), this would mean that they were reduced to bondage and served in Solomon's temple. Gezer, too, remained Canaanite until Solomon's time, and it seems to follow that the stories in Judges xvii–1 Samuel, which circle around the district in which the above-named places lay, require a more critical study from a historical point of view.

One knows that the account of the conquest reflected in Judges i is at variance with that which characterizes the Book of Joshua. It is agreed by most critics that the latter gives us an unhistorical representation and that subsequent history confirms the *general* impression conveyed by Judges i. A more comprehensive survey of the earlier tradition for the history of the pre-monarchic period seems necessary, and in conjunction with it attention must be drawn to another important feature. In the annals of Solomon it is left to the reader to infer that David had overthrown the Philistine power, and so far the evidence of 2 Sam. viii. 1 appears to be substantiated. But whilst Solomon is said to have subjugated the rest of the Amorites, we hear little enough of the steps taken by Saul and David to overcome the non-Israelite inhabitants of Palestine. The trend of history would lead us to expect that the first two kings continued the work which Judges i proves to have been unfinished, and which Solomon himself completed. So far from this being the case, both Saul and David have to contend with a new enemy, the Philistines, and David's exploits in the vicinity of the Jebusite fortress are not with "Canaanites" or "Amorites" as might have been anticipated, but with Philistines. One may hope that it is not "hypercritical" to find in the Philistines of the books of Judges and Samuel another difficulty. We may accept the evidence of the Egyptian monuments and believe that they entered Palestine before

the twelfth century, and we may provisionally assume with W. M. Müller that whilst they occupied the central sea-board, their allies the Zakkara (Takkara) held Dor and the (Cretan ?) Cherithites settled in South Judah. In a word, we may admit the external evidence which appears to "confirm" the tradition preserved in the Old Testament, and, this being so, we must infer from the literary evidence that the Philistines settled among the Canaanites and became to all intents and purposes "Semitized." To quote from Prof. Moore[1]:—

"Of whatever stock and speech the invaders may have been in Palestine they very soon adopted the language of the country; the Philistine names in the Old Testament and the Assyrian inscriptions are ... almost without exception Semitic—specifically Canaanite. The Philistines worshipped the gods of the country also."

Although they must have mingled with the people and disappeared in it, yet, contrary to expectation, they emerge later and appear as an independent folk, with their own kings and policy. It is perhaps remarkable that these early invaders should have thus arisen again to form separate states in the eighth century, and a closer study of some of the earlier references only increases the obscurity. After Samuel's defeat of the Philistines it is observed that there was peace between Israel and the *Amorites* (1 Sam. vii. 14). Of the five cities of the Philistines, three were held by the semi-mythical sons of Anak (Joshua xi. 22), giants like some of the Philistine heroes themselves, and it is noteworthy that Caleb drives out from Hebron the Anakim who appear elsewhere as Canaanites (Judges i. 10). The district south of Judah is occupied by Canaanites (Num. xxi. 1–3, Judges i. 17), Amalekites (Num. xiv. 42–45), Amorites (Deut. i. 44), and it is safe to conclude from yet another reference (Gen. xxvi) that the same district could be regarded as Philistine. Literary criticism has resolved some of the difficulties which are caused by these fluctuating usages and one is tempted to go a step further and regard with scepticism the use of the ethnic "Philistine" throughout the earlier history. Is it possible that in some cases the term is characteristic of a literary circle (cp. the use of "Canaanite," "Amorite") and really denotes the non-Israelite inhabitants of Palestine, whilst, in others, tradition has thrown back incidents which rightfully belong to a period a century or two later? On the strength of the Egyptian evidence, it would seem that the actual name is correct, but it does not follow therefore that it was always confined to the descendants of the Purusati who must have become merged with the Canaanites by the time of

[1] *Encyc. Bib.*, s. v. "Philistines," § 12.

Saul [1]. There appears to have been frequent intercourse between the southern sea-coast of Palestine and the lands of the Eastern Mediterranean throughout the whole of the Old Testament period, and it is possible that foreigners, from Greece or Asia Minor, might have been regarded as of the same race as the original Purusati. There are obscure allusions to the Philistines in the days of Nadab (1 Kings xv. 27) and Elah (ib. xvi. 15 sqq.), that dark period in the history of Israel on which the records throw so little light. It was an age when, as the Homeric poems show, there were relations between Palestine and the lands of the Levant, and it will be remembered that later tradition knew of Greek intercourse with Dor and Gaza. The subsequent features of Palestinian archaeology *may* imply that at this time a new settlement arose in Southern Palestine, but most weight must be laid upon the appearance of the separate Philistine states in the eighth century, of which the Assyrian inscriptions have much to tell us. One of the most perplexing phenomena of the eighth century is the picture of the Philistine power which the cuneiform evidence has presented to us, and of the two possibilities: (*a*) the resurrection of the people with whom Saul and David contended, (*b*) an invasion of an alien stock (in the time of Nadab and Elah?), the latter seems to deserve further consideration.

[1] It is even questionable from the Egyptian data whether the Purusati, after the great defeat inflicted upon them by Ramses III, were able to make any considerable impression upon the population of Palestine. Possibly it is only because of the representation in the books of Samuel that it is assumed that they did succeed.

IV. Saul and Benjamin.

The ordinary conception of the history of Israel is necessarily founded upon that of the narratives of the Old Testament, and these, in their turn, naturally give expression to the views that prevailed at the time when the several sources were first written down, or when some compiler fitted them into his framework. But there is a fundamental difference between objective and subjective history, between the actual course of the events themselves and the representation of those events from the pen of the historical writer, and it is the work of literary criticism in conjunction with historical criticism to investigate the character of the sources and to test them in the light of history. It is evident that both must be combined. We may find an approximate date for a narrative, psalm, or prophecy by considering the internal evidence in its relation to the historical situation at a certain specified period, but unless we are in a position to conclude that our historical sources for that period are trustworthy, the results must be somewhat provisional. It is necessary to lay particular emphasis upon the claims of historical criticism, since it forces us now and again to reconsider the results of literary criticism, and at times to qualify and correct them. Historical connexion or the continuity of history, upon which historians naturally lay much weight[1], accordingly compels us to go behind literary critical results; and in view of the character of the material, strict methods of research can only be applied where the literary material is comparatively wealthy.

External witnesses before the period of Old Testament history, in particular the Amarna Letters, present a picture of early Syria and Palestine under certain political conditions, and when every allowance is made for the exceptional circumstances of that age, one is able to gain a faithful impression of internal relations, of the life, and even of the thought of the fifteenth century. Six centuries later the historical material is again comparatively rich, and the Assyrian evidence provides welcome independent testi-

[1] Cp. e. g. Kuenen, "The Critical Method," in the *Modern Review*, 1880, p. 481, *et passim*.

mony for the general situation in the middle of the ninth century (about 860–839 B. C.). With the help of the evidence based upon a critical study of this period, it is possible to estimate more safely the details of the scantier sources for the years which immediately precede and follow. Midway between these two important periods come the beginnings of Hebrew history. Here we are almost entirely without external evidence, and are practically confined to a considerable body of native literature of unequal historical value. The very bulk is overwhelming, and he who has followed the external evidence through the Amarna Letters and the Egyptian data, finds himself suddenly plunged into a new world. The work of literary criticism has successfully disentangled the threads, and enables us to view the whole in its proper perspective. It is the work of historical criticism to determine the historicity of these early traditions. As is well known, it is a matter of dispute at what point to begin the history of the Hebrews—with the patriarchs; the Exodus; the judges; the first kings? Strictly speaking, the history presumably begins where the situation is such that it fits naturally into the course of events regarded as a whole. But in the scantiness of our external evidence, particularly for the twelfth and eleventh centuries, there is hardly sufficient material for our purpose. Hence it is necessary to examine anew the early traditions; to attempt to classify them, and to resolve them, as far as possible, into their constituent elements in the hope of determining the relative position of each in the history of the people.

When it is considered how remote is the period with which the narratives deal, it is proper to ask how far we are entitled to assume that early compilers arranged their material in strict chronological order, and when we realize the rapidity with which tradition springs up or reshapes itself in the East, it is difficult to determine how much confidence can be placed in records, purporting to relate to events of—let us say—the eleventh century, which are preserved in a literary form of the seventh, eighth, or even ninth century B. C. It does not seem justifiable, at all events, to assume that there was a long gap between the earliest written narratives and the considerably later exilic literary activity. Indeed, on the strength of literary criticism, it is evident that we possess a series of records which are obviously earlier than the Deuteronomic standpoint although approximating it. Accordingly, if many of the oldest portions of Samuel are to be regarded as almost—or, for historical purposes, practically—contemporary, we are forced to assume that for a considerable period the work of putting tradition into writing was at a standstill. This does not seem probable.

In the conjectural attempts which have been made in the course of the present series of notes to sift the traditions extending through the books of Judges and Samuel, one definite goal has been kept in view, viz. the oldest traditions of the time of Saul. It was held, that (*a*) on literary grounds there was support for the belief that the introduction to the oppression of Israel by Ammon and the Philistines (Judges x. 6 sqq.) marked the commencement of a period which ended with Samuel's great victory at Mizpah (1 Sam. vii)[1]. These chapters cover the ground from Jephthah to the rise of Saul. (*b*) On literary grounds, again, it was held that the appendix to Judges (Judges xvii–xxi) was of distinct origin; that the stories of Samuel's youth arose after his life-work, and that the older portions of 1 Sam. i–vii are confined to those narratives which relate to Eli and the ark[2]. (*c*) The establishment of the monarchy under Saul is marked by literary features analogous to those of the Introduction, in so far that the former contains recognizable secondary tradition (1 Sam. viii, x. 17 sqq., xii) overshadowing the earlier narratives where the figure of Samuel is less idealized. It seemed necessary (*d*) that for historical criticism the attempt should be made to realize how the history originally read before the late (Deuteronomic) redaction, and the Introduction in an earlier form appeared to imply an earlier account of Saul's accession. From the historical point of view, the stories of Samson could be readily ignored, since with the history of Central Palestine (already detailed in Judges vi–ix) they had no points of contact. But they dealt with a Danite hero and with affrays with Philistines, and thus appeared to have some material connexion with Judges xvii sq., and these in turn appeared to be linked with the older passages in 1 Sam. i–vii. Moreover, their contents appeared on historical grounds to be unsuitable to their context; they broke the continuity of history, and were associated with other cycles of tradition which implied other circumstances and conditions. On these grounds the tradition which had placed them in the days before Saul's accession was regarded as untrustworthy. Literary points of contact between the Introduction and Saul's rise, the impossibility of finding the historical situation which the latter presupposed save in Judges x. 6 sq., and the unsuitability of the intervening narratives thus appeared to point independently to the conclusion that the original object of this Introduction was to prepare the way for the last judge and the first king of Israel. Although

[1] For earlier views regarding the connexion between the chapters of Judges and 1 Sam. in question, see G. F. Moore, *Judges*, 276; H. P. Smith, *Samuel*, 4; K. Budde, *Samuel*, 2.

[2] See above, pp. 24, 27, 33 sq.

these intervening narratives do not appear to be available for the history of this period, they have a distinct value of their own. History is something more than the bare record of facts, and even the most untrustworthy of accounts is precious material for the study of the development of thought and tradition. Although removed, therefore, they are not altogether rejected, and it is not improbable that room for some of them could be found in certain other cycles of tradition which they both illustrate and supplement.

The importance of observing carefully the literary features of a document as a preparation for its historical criticism is obvious. If, in the study of the history of a certain period, it is found that the narratives are derived from two or more sources, it by no means follows that each separate source represented the same historical background as or was parallel to the others. The critical investigation of the Hexateuch teaches that the attempt must be made to view each separately in the first instance: the mere presence of literary complexity being an indication that *for some reason* an editor or compiler has exchanged one source for another. Naturally, a break in the literary continuity does not necessarily entail a break in the historical continuity; it may happen that the sources will sometimes appear to have traversed the same ground. On the other hand, the whole standpoint may be markedly different, and it may have to be recognized that the two not only cannot belong to the same period, but also cannot reflect the same historical situation. It is at once clear that the later theocratic account of Saul's election cannot be reconciled with the oldest narratives, and this is now very generally admitted; but the exilic standpoint was no sudden growth, it was the outcome of a gradual development which must have left its mark somewhere in tradition, whether oral or written. It is precisely these stages in its growth which seem to account for the accumulation of tradition around Saul and the circumstances attending his rise: the intervening narratives representing the progress of tradition in the intervening centuries between the earliest written narratives and the latest exilic (or rather post-exilic) redaction.

It has been suggested that the traditions which have grown up around Samuel find their analogy in the literary history of the figures of Elijah and Elisha (p. 35 above). Originally, it is possible that Saul rose without the intervention of Samuel[1]. There was a tendency in certain circles to magnify the part played by prophetic

[1] Similarly, several critics are of opinion that the account of the anointing of David by Samuel (1 Sam. xvi. 1–13) is a late addition.

or priestly figures in the history of great political events, and considering the immense importance of Saul's period it would not be surprising if tradition, perhaps at a comparatively early stage, associated the rise of the new king with the prophet's activity. The literary evidence is not conclusive, but the following notes will show how far the belief can be justified.

The tradition that Saul's home was in Benjamin is undoubtedly persistent, but it does not enter into the oldest account of his defeat of the Philistines[1]; and the story of his deliverance of Jabesh-Gilead (on the analogy of the stories of the judges) might suggest that his home lay near that city. Where Saul's history is intertwined with that of Samuel or David, Benjamin is prominent, but in one noteworthy chapter, where we have an independent narrative of Saul, the indications point to a more northerly centre[2]. Here Israel is at Jezreel (cp. Saul at Endor, xxviii. 7), the Philistines at Shunem and Aphek, and the battle is on Mt. Gilboa. Was Saul's original home in this district? The evidence supplied by his genealogy (ix. 1) is indecisive, and, unfortunately, in addition to its unnatural length, the details are not above suspicion. It was enough to describe David as "a son of Jesse" or Jeroboam as a "son of Nebat"; not until a considerably later date do the genealogies become extensive. Hence it is possible that the fullness of Saul's ancestry is due to conflation. It would be tempting to suppose that the traditional Benjamite origin has been combined with an older—the original one. We learn that Saul was the son of "a man of Benjamin, whose name was Kish, the son of Abiel, the son of Zeror, the son of Bechorath, the son of Aphiah, the son of a Benjamite." Kish might suggest some connexion with Kishon; Zeror (αρεδ, σαρα) might point to Z-r-d—thus suggesting Zeredah[3]; Bechorath can stand for Bichri, the Benjamite clan, but Lucian's recension read Machir; Aphiah has been emended to "(from) Gibeah," but the LXX αφεκ takes us northwards to Aphek. We can scarcely venture to recover the oldest form of the genealogy from this, but it is clear that for some reason or other the text has suffered, and in its present form indisputably makes Saul of Benjamite origin. But the variant readings and

[1] See above, pp. 20 sqq.

[2] See above, p. 30. Josiah's tactics in marching north to Megiddo to arrest the progress of Necho can scarcely be cited as an analogy; the historical circumstances are entirely different.

[3] The reading Zeredah is not certain (*Encyc. Bib.*, s.v.). It is not safe, therefore, to associate the name in Saul's genealogy with the home of Jeroboam I (1 Kings xi. 26). But it would be very natural if tradition had held that this king was associated with Saul's home or family.

the state of the text are phenomena which require to be kept in view.

Next, the account of Saul's wanderings in search of the lost asses is again unfortunately indecisive (ch. ix). We are shown Saul and his servant journeying after the lost asses. The search is fruitless, and at length Saul proposes to abandon further attempts. He fears lest his father should grow anxious for their safety, and one could gain the very natural impression that their journey has been a long one (contrast ver. 20). The narrative describes the route in a somewhat remarkable manner (ver. 4): "And they passed through Mount Ephraim, and passed through the land of Shalishah, and did not find [them]; and they passed through the land of Shaalim, and they were not there; and they passed through the land of Benjamin, and did not find them[1]": (by this time) they had come to the land of Zuph, and Saul learns that "in this city" there was a man of God who would be able to direct them (ver. 5 sq.). The place-names are lamentably obscure. Shalishah may be the Baal-Shalishah of 2 Kings iv. 42, whence came the man who visited Elisha at Gilgal; Shaalim may suggest the land of Shual (1 Sam. xiii. 17), or Hazar-Shual in South Judah (1 Chron. iv. 28); but it is conceivably an error for Shaalbim near Aijalon and Bethshemesh. The site of Zuph and the identification of "this city" can scarcely be recovered from this passage. It will doubtless be readily admitted that the linguistic character of the verse is noteworthy; the passage has the appearance of being unduly loaded, and it seems safe to assume that it has been revised in favour of some specific tradition. If the present intention of the verse is to bring the scene of the wanderings into close connexion with Saul's traditional home, it is conceivable that the earlier view implied another situation.

Again, when we turn to the account of the homeward journey, the evidence is still elusive. Rachel's sepulchre is to be placed either in the neighbourhood of Bethlehem (Gen. xxxv. 19, xlviii. 7, glosses ?), or north of Jerusalem; Zelzah is obviously a corrupt reading, and emendations cannot be of any assistance. The oak of Tabor obviously suggests the north, but, following the prevailing tradition, has been identified with Deborah's tree, between Ramah and Bethel (Judges iv. 5). The question is here complicated by the probability that the successive changes are due to repeated redaction (on which see above, p. 22 sq.), but one may attach some importance to the situation in ver. 3 which implies that Saul on reaching the oak of Tabor would meet messengers on their way to Bethel. Even the name Deborah itself

[1] עבר ("pass through," or "cross into"), in the singular, in every case except the third.

suggests a connexion with Daberath at the western foot of Tabor (see G. F. Moore on Judges iv. 5).

We have next to consider where Samuel's home was placed. The genealogy in 1 Sam. i. 1 is exceptionally long and in all probability conflate, and it is quite uncertain whether two views of Samuel's ancestry have been combined[1], or whether some of its members should not belong to the genealogy of Eli who is so abruptly introduced into the narrative. Tradition has placed his home at Ramah, and the name is common enough: Bêt Rima, north-east of Lydda; Râm Allah, nine miles, and er-Râm, four miles north of Jerusalem; a south Judaean site has also been thought possible. But Ramah is said to be Zuphite, and it was in Zuph that Saul found Samuel (ix. 5). Here, unfortunately, the name of the city is not stated (ver. 6), whence it has been conjectured that the narrative implies that Ramah was *not* his city. But it must be admitted that if a scribe could easily delete the original name, it would have been equally easy to add Ramah as a gloss. Zuph has even been identified with Zephath, south of Beersheba, and it has been observed that Samuel's sons were judges in Beersheba (viii. 2); David's flight to the south of Judah, it has been thought, was for the object of being near Samuel, and support for this has been found in the appearance of Samuel near Carmel (south of Hebron) in 1 Sam. xv. The evidence which has been surveyed is hardly strong enough to allow any confident conclusion. There can be no doubt respecting the view which the present traditions would have us take, but considering the character of the texts it is hardly an unfair suggestion that attempts have been made to modify and adjust some earlier tradition. On the analogy of the stories of Elisha, for example, we may hesitate to confine Samuel to one particular home; one cycle of traditions may have placed him in the vicinity of Saul's court; whilst in another the scenes of his activity may have been among the prophetic guilds.

The particular details which have been noticed are extremely complicated, and tantalizing in the possibilities they afford. Leaving these on one side, it is noteworthy that in 1 Sam. ix. 1–14, Saul (of Gibeah?) seems to be ignorant of Samuel (cp. ver. 19), although the whole trend of the traditions in their present form would show that they lived within a few miles of each other. This might be explained away by the view that Saul is here represented as a raw stripling[2]. In

[1] Marquart, *Fundamente israel. u. jüd. Gesch.*, p. 12 sq.

[2] See above, p. 22. Those who regard the discrepancy as illusory must find Saul's ignorance perplexing.

ix. 15 sqq., the fact that Saul is to come "from the land of Benjamin" (ver. 16) points somewhat forcibly to the view that their homes were remote. If Saul came from Gibeah we might expect his journey to have taken him far away from Benjamite territory; is it safe to assume that the time had been spent in wandering about a comparatively restricted area?[1]

These considerations, however, are not of great weight by themselves. But on the strength of one cycle of traditions, it is reasonable to conclude that Jerusalem, if not the district immediately surrounding it, was Jebusite (cp. above, p. 42 sq.), and it does not seem to accord with ordinary probability that Saul's home was at Gibeah, only a few miles to the north. Moreover, when we turn to another cycle of traditions, it is not easy to reconcile the ordinary view with the circumstance that the country was in the greatest distress owing to the Philistines, and that some of the Hebrews had deserted to the enemy, whilst others had taken refuge beyond the Jordan. The state of affairs, already outlined in Judges x (above, p. 25 sq.), demanded prompt action, and leaves no room for aught else. The oldest traditions of Saul knew of a crisis when the people were plunged in the lowest depths of despair, and only those statements can be regarded as appropriate which agree with this situation. Consequently, one has only to endeavour to realize the internal situation to perceive that the narratives in ix. sq. do not bear the impress of being contemporary. The people's hopeless position points to a time when the only security was to be found in flight or in hiding in caverns and holes; the roads were doubtless unsafe for travel, and there were some who may well have been forced to beat out their wheat in wine-presses to save it from the enemy. It was scarcely a time to hunt for lost asses when the land was in the hands of spoilers, and the peaceful picture of the seer and the sacrificial feast ill accord with the disturbances which the sequel presupposes. But Saul gained his magnificent victory through the help of Yahweh; it was no mere feat of arms, but an event of far-reaching consequences for the future of Israel. The circumstances were exceptional, and led to an epoch-making sequel; and whilst the achievements of an Ehud, a Gideon, or a Jephthah are related simply as isolated incidents without further ado, the history of Saul's rise has been built up into its present form by successive stages, in the course of which later ages sought to illustrate its importance in accordance with the beliefs that prevailed[2].

[1] It is possible that in one form of the tradition it was only Saul's *dôd* who lived at Gibeah (x. 14).

[2] The growth of Judges vi sq. is partly parallel (see e.g. G. F. Moore's

The attempt to recover the oldest traditions resulted in the view that two leading episodes form the basis of the history of the period: (1) The great victory over the Philistines, and (2) the deliverance of Jabesh-Gilead. Both of them are closely associated with the earlier phases of the "Introduction" and the present history of Jephthah. With the latter we may associate the subsequent events in which Gilead plays a prominent part, whilst in the former the scene is shifted to the southern part of central Palestine, and takes us to a series of traditions with which the history of David is now combined. It is here that we find particular interest in the district of Benjamin.

If Saul is traditionally associated in the closest manner with Benjamin, it is not impossible that it was through him this tribe first attained any prominence[1]. It is natural to suppose that the tribes had their own cycles of traditions regarding their heroes, and if the smallest of them all first came into existence under Saul, it is possible, perhaps, to recover one of the motives of the remarkable stories in Judges xix–xxi. Many influences have tended to shape the narrative, and a new one now seems clear. It is evident that when once the theory prevailed that Israel had always been a national confederation of a certain number of tribes, there would be no room for the later origin of Benjamin. It could be, and indeed was said, that the youngest of Jacob's sons was born in Palestine, but the whole trend of tradition from the descent of the children of Israel into Egypt to the invasion of Canaan by the tribes would stand in contradiction to the older view. For the purpose of reconciliation, it might be assumed that at an early date, "when there was no king in Israel," the whole tribe was practically wiped out of existence[2]. It will be noticed that the narrative betrays no friendly feeling towards the tribe, and consequently its details can

analysis in the *Polychrome Bible*). Here one can observe the old story of Gideon's achievement, E's account with its stories of the fleece and the episode of the altar of Baal; the preliminary account (also by E) of the prophet sent to the Israelites, and finally the Deuteronomic introduction and conclusion, the former preserving some traces of older material.

[1] On Ehud the Benjamite, see *Encyc. Bib.*, s.v., and observe that although the tribe is mentioned in Judges v. 14, the connexion with Hos. v. 8 makes the reference perplexing.

[2] The historical foundation for the story of the offence of Gibeah is quite obscure. Even in Hosea's time (x. 9) the sin of Benjamin would hardly have been applied to all Israel, who in point of fact justly punished the sinful city.

only be used with great caution; but it implies that the decimated tribe was built up by marriage with the maidens of Shiloh (xxi), and a post-exilic section, which might be based on a sound tradition, has prefaced this by the account of an alliance with Jabesh-Gilead.

Thus outlined, the details are suggestive. The youngest of the tribes after entering Canaan (it scarcely appears in the old stories of the Judges) is practically exterminated, and starts a new lease of life with the influx of fresh blood from Shiloh and Jabesh-Gilead at the very time that the narratives are preparing the way for the rise of Saul. The motive for the extermination of the tribe now seems apparent, and if the account of its reconstruction may be accepted, new light is thrown upon the earliest traditions of Benjamin.

A number of indications have seemed to point to the belief that Saul was originally *not* Benjamite, and since it has been found that part of the work ascribed to Joshua appears to have been based upon traditions of Saul, it is not unlikely that other features in the life of Joshua may prove helpful. If Saul, like Joshua, had come from without, it is not improbable that his obscure relations with the Gibeonites ought to be read more closely in the light of Joshua ix. We are accustomed to assume that for some reason or other Saul entered into a covenant with the Amorites of Canaan, and whilst it is far from easy to explain why the Benjamites of Gibeah found it necessary at this stage of their history to enter into an alliance, it becomes readily intelligible if we suppose that a body of immigrants had newly settled in the district[1]. It may be gathered from 2 Sam. iv. 2 sq., Joshua ix. 17, that Beeroth had been affected at the same time, and the murder of Ishbaal may reasonably be regarded as an act of vengeance analogous to that demanded by the Gibeonites[2].

[1] H. P. Smith, on 2 Sam. xxi. 2, remarks that "such covenants were very common during the process which ended in the establishment of Israel in Canaan." To this it is to be added that they would naturally be made at the earliest opportunity, and not at a comparatively late stage in their traditional history.

[2] Kennedy (*Century Bible: Samuel*, p. 325 sq.) conjectures that Saul attempted to recover the ark from Kirjath-jearim (leagued with Gibeon and Beeroth in Joshua ix. 17), and rejects Kosters' view that 1 Sam. vi is unhistorical by urging "the antiquity and general credibility" of that source. The argument that very early sources are therefore credible, or that those which appear to be credible are therefore ancient, requires to be supported by other considerations, and Prof. Kennedy himself is obliged to assume that although the Philistines sent the ark from their

Both Beeroth and Gibeon play an important part in the history of Saul's house after the disaster of Mount Gilboa, and if it is to be inferred that they seized the first opportunity of vengeance, the circumstance would seem to point either to the success with which Saul ruled over these people or to a comparatively late date in his lifetime for the occupation of the district.

The old name of Benjamin was Ben-Oni, the latter half of which has been compared with Beth-On (Beth-Aven) to the east of Bethel, near Ai[1]. Other comparisons have been made, but this is interesting on account of the associations of the district. According to the story, Jacob had crossed from Gilead to Shechem, and had

confines, it "remained within the sphere of their political jurisdiction, and so was inaccessible to the Hebrew authorities." This explanation of Saul's dealings with the league and the attempt to reconcile divergent traditions appear to ignore the plain sense of 1 Sam. vi. The whole chapter would be stultified and its credibility endangered, if it meant that the ark was *not* returned to the Hebrews. What writer, even of the latter half of the tenth century (Kennedy's date) would have described the Philistines' anxiety to rid themselves of the dangerous object, the joy of the men of Beth-shemesh, and the contented return of the Philistine lords, if the sacred ark still remained inaccessible to Israel? But if it be granted that the narrative belongs to an entirely distinct tradition of the fortunes of the ark, one of the great embarrassments of the history of the period disappears; see above, pp. 37 sqq., and below, p. 90.

[1] The account of the battle of Ai is extremely complicated, and in an earlier stage of the narrative Bethel presumably was more prominent than it is now. The magical effect of Joshua's outstretched javelin is noteworthy (Joshua viii. 18, 26) as also are the precise allusions to his preparations for spending the night (verses 9, 13). When we consider the sacred associations of Bethel and the site between it and Ai, it may not be too bold to conjecture that a theophany in the style of v. 13–15 once found a place here. The vision in question is located at Jericho, but it is possible that the traditions have been confused. The capture of Bethel is ascribed to the Joseph tribes in Judges i. 22 sqq., and one may notice the parallels with the story of the fall of Jericho (especially Joshua ii. 12–14, vi. 23, 25).

In considering the various traditions of Joshua and Saul it is also necessary to bear in mind the possibility that some confusion may have been caused by the existence of several Gilgals (see *Encyc. Bib.*, col. 1730 sqq.). Moreover, it has been suggested (p. 21) that Saul's defeat of the Philistines was concerned with a story of Gilgal, "rolling" (1 Sam. xiv. 33). Tradition has associated with the former the story of a broken vow, and Jonathan's words, "My father has brought trouble (or disaster עכר) upon the land" (ver. 29), recall the story of the naming of Achor after the defeat of Israel at Ai (Joshua vii).

thence turned southwards to Bethel, in which district Rachel died in childbirth[1]. Another of the ancestral legends narrates Abram's journey from Haran through Shechem to Bethel (without stating whether the Jordan was crossed), and at a spot between Bethel and Ai the patriarch is said to have pitched his tent and to have built an altar to the name of Yahweh (Gen. xii. 8). The importance of the spot in early tradition is shown further by Joshua viii. 9, and it is interesting to observe that if Joshua commemorated his victory, the account has been omitted by a later compiler in favour of the story of the erection of another altar—at Ebal. There is some reason to believe that according to one tradition Joshua himself crossed the Jordan at a more northerly ford than that in the present account, and that his first step was the occupation of central Palestine. This theory of the invasion of central Canaan is supported partly by the analogy of the story of Jacob, and partly by the book of Joshua itself, whose account of the erection of an altar on Mount Ebal presupposes a conquest which is nowhere narrated. From Deut. xxvii. 1–8, and Joshua viii. 30–ix. 2, it may be inferred that this altar was erected on the day that the Jordan was crossed, and that this event was the signal for the rising of the Canaanites[2]. If Joshua, like Jacob, crossed at the Jabbok, an easy road leads to Shechem, and the arguments of those who support the theory show that there is some room for this tradition by the side of the more familiar one.

Tradition has its own way of recounting history, and it is a curious coincidence that the spot which, in one tradition, enters into the story of conflicts between Israel and the Canaanites, becomes, in another, the place where Abraham and Lot separate. Further, according to P, the theophany at Bethel and the change of Jacob's

[1] À propos of the change of name in connexion with the birth of Benjamin, it may be noticed that Abram and Sarai receive their new names in a context associated with the birth of Isaac and the blessing of Ishmael. What old tradition underlies P's story of the introduction of circumcision (Gen. xvii, see especially ver. 18) can scarcely be ascertained. It is at least interesting to recall Robertson Smith's view of the connexion between the names Sarah and Israel (*Kinship and Marriage*[2], p. 34), and to observe the separation of Ishmael and Isaac at the birth of the latter.

[2] Many motives have been at work in the literary history of the Exodus and Conquest, and among them must be the removal of the body of Joseph. Despite the scanty references (Gen. l. 25 sq., Exod. xiii. 19, Joshua xxiv. 32) in the present texts, this pious duty must have occupied a prominent part in the traditions of the Joseph tribes, the conquest of whose territory (one would imagine) would be recounted at length.

name occurred after he had left Shechem (Gen. xxxv. 6 *a*, 9–13, 15), and that this view rests upon old tradition appears to follow from Hos. xii. 4. But how this source explained the name Israel cannot be conjectured; it may have given a story of a striving at Bethel or another explanation of its origin. The account of the birth of Benjamin follows immediately, and to this the compiler has appended a notice of Reuben's offence with Bilhah which is distinctly interesting on account of the points of contact between the tribes of Reuben and Benjamin. Unfortunately, only the merest fragment of the episode has survived, and the compiler for some reason proceeds to enumerate the sons of Jacob (P), and adds an Edomite genealogical table in which is preserved a brief account of the separation of Jacob and Esau, singularly akin to the story of Abraham and Lot (xxxvi. 6–8, cp. xiii. 6). What this really means it is very difficult to say, but Professor Hogg has observed that the birth of the tribe in Gen. xxxv. 18 sq. is connected in some way with the disappearance of Rachel[1], which might suggest that Rachel was the old name of the early population of this district. At all events it is interesting to find a recurrence of the same type of names in Benjamin, Judah, and the south[2].

It is notoriously hazardous to rely solely upon proper names, or even on national traditions themselves, but the evidence for the population of Benjamin is distinctly puzzling, and the fact that legend makes Rachel of Aramaean origin is probably of less significance than the circumstances attending her death. Tradition is wont to build up its diverse elements into a harmonious whole, and it is hardly possible to determine with confidence where the grafting has taken place. Such points of contact as have been noticed appear

[1] *Encyc. Bib.*, "Benjamin," § 3.

[2] Thus the name Oni reminds one also of Onan, a son of Judah (Gen. xxxviii. 4), and of Onam, a name in a Jerahmeelite genealogy (1 Chron. ii. 26), and an Edomite clan (Gen. xxxvi. 23). Ono, too, is Benjamite, near Lod (Lydda). With the Benjamite Iri, cp. Iram, Ira, and Iru (Edomite, Judaean, and Calebite), and with his father Bela (1 Chron. vii. 7) cp. the first king of Edom. Jobab (ibid., viii. 9) is also Arabian and Edomite. See the *Encyc. Bib.* on these names, also on Shephupham, Shupham, Shuppim (cp. Shepho, Gen. xxxvi. 23, LXX *σωφαν*); Jeush; Ashbel (cp. perhaps Ashbea, 1 Chron. iv. 21); Naaman (Gen. xlvi. 21, cp. Naam of Caleb and Naamah, Joshua xv. 41). Further, compounds of חם are practically South Palestinian, and the element Jeru-, Jeri-, seems to be distinctive of the same district (but note Jeriel in 1 Chron. vii. 2). Many of the names in כב and the majority of animal names also prevail in the south.

to be more than mere coincidences, and the attempt to understand the traditions of Saul with the help of certain of the traditions of Joshua seems to be justified.

The two great achievements which are ascribed to Saul are (*a*) the deliverance of Jabesh-Gilead, and (*b*) the defeat of the Philistines. The former suggests a northerly position for the hero's home, in the latter Gilgal is the starting-point (cp. also in the story of Joshua, x. 6). Two of the patriarchal figures are found moving down from Shechem to Bethel, and a certain spot which owes its sanctity to one of them marks the division of Israel from the Lot tribes, and the overthrow of the older inhabitants of the land by a new race. So, in the story of the other patriarch, a new tribe is born, and whilst one cycle of tradition perhaps associated its growth with Saul, another makes the defeat of the older stock part of the great national epic of the conquest of Canaan. To one, the Philistines appear the most natural enemy, to another, the Canaanites; but they agree that some alliance was made with the earlier inhabitants, and both leave it possible to hold that the movement had come in the first instance from the north or from the east (*a* and *b* above). It might even be conjectured that Saul, like Jacob, was supposed to have come from Gilead, in which case his relations to Jabesh-Gilead may find a faint echo in the covenant between Laban and Jacob[1].

It seems not improbable that we may find in the present life of Saul the same variety of motives that has gone to build up the patriarchal figures. The memory of tribal migrations and feuds, the familiar experiences of daily life, and the personal history of noted ancestors appear to be blended, and the floating elements of tradition have attached themselves now to one and now to another of the ancient names. It would be arbitrary to draw a distinction between the literary and historical criticism of the narratives in Genesis and that of the records in the "Former Prophets," on the ground that the former belong to a pre-historic and the latter to a historic period. There is no reason to suppose that less care was taken in the compilation of the former than in that of the latter, or that the traditions of the great ancestors developed upon lines quite distinct from those of the early judges and kings. Historical criticism, to be consistent, cannot start with any undue presumption in favour of the trustworthiness of narratives relegated to the monarchical period to the detriment of those of the "patriarchal" age or of the book of Chronicles. All have had a complicated history, and it is not difficult to perceive that what has come down to us

[1] Cp. also the story of the bond between Benjamin and Jabesh-Gilead (Judges xxi).

is the result of a long process of selection and rejection. There was a certain amount of material (written and oral) upon which the old historians could draw, and in investigating the use which they have made of it, it is indispensable to remember that their aim was above all a religious one. Their object was to demonstrate the working of the Divine Will, and to adapt the history of the past to the needs of the present—even if it had been their purpose to relate the records of their country simply, they would have suffered from the same limitations as all other ancient historians.

Had the books been written with the sole object of recording the secular history of Israel, it is obvious from the allusions in the book of Kings that there were many noteworthy events which (one might have supposed) would have been eminently suitable for the didactic writers. For example, it would appear from 1 Kings xv. 27, xvi. 15, that at least twice within a quarter of a century there was war with the Philistines in a district in which Judah was vitally interested. It is impossible to say how long it lasted, but it is evident that it must have impressed the districts affected. But the Israelite annals do not state what part Judah played in the events, and the Judaean annals of the contemporary king Asa ignore the war. Even before Omri became king of Israel there was serious internal dissension until the party under Tibni lost their leader. But of this formidable affair tradition seems to have preserved no recollection. It must appear extremely remarkable that such episodes as these which must have lingered in the memory of the people, if they did not actually exist in a written form, have disappeared entirely from the pages of history, whilst, on the other hand, the compilers have handed down stories of internal jealousy and conflict of the days of the Judges and wars with the Philistines of the time of Saul and David.

Hence, in dealing with all historical material which is carried back to such an early period as that now under consideration, it is very important to remind ourselves of what must have transpired in the history of Israel and Judah between the time when certain events were supposed to have taken place, and the time when they were first put into writing. Even subsequent to the la..r stage, as the various narratives were gradually reaching their present form, history was not stationary. But, on the one hand, the extent of our historical material from the days of Saul and David onward is comparatively scanty, perhaps one may go so far as to say that it is suspiciously scanty. On the other hand, there are stories relating to the pre-monarchic period which (in their present form at least) belong to the centuries of the monarchy. In these circumstances, it becomes far

from improbable that narratives dealing with comparatively remote events are coloured by the recollection of those comparatively recent. Thus, there is always the possibility (not to use a stronger word) that even in the older sources relating to the earlier periods, the memory of events still fresh in the mind has coloured the traditions of the past, and it would hardly be safe to assert that the events which have been considered in the course of these notes do not contain some fragments of genuine history subsequent to the days of Saul and David.

V. Meribath-Kadesh.

Ancient writings were written for a motive, and, however enlightened the writer may have been, they are intended to portray events in the light in which they were regarded in his time, either by himself or by the circle on whose behalf they were undertaken. They may or may not be absolutely credible, but it is necessary in the first instance to realize that the existence of a literary work implies some definite aim or object. Further, it is important for the critic to recognize the presence of the religious factor in the composition of history, for not only does every writer arrange his material in order to give effect to a special view, but he handles it from some specific religious standpoint. So, every piece of writing bears the impress of its age, and has been subject to the manifold influences from which no record is free. It treats of the past in accordance with the requirements of the present, and will often prefer to represent the present in the past in order to furnish authority and precedent for that which is contemporary. As Kuenen has appositely remarked:—

> "In ancient time and specifically in Israel, the sense of historical continuity could only be preserved by the constant compliance on the part of the past with the requirements of the present, that is to say its constant renovation and transformation. This may be called the law of religious historiography. At any rate it dominates the historical writings alike of the Israelites and of the early Christians[1]."

In dealing with records of remote events, therefore, many questions constantly arise: are the records contemporary, are they authentic, or do they depend upon sources which are not only not contemporary, but embody later tradition; if so, can the earlier traditions be recovered; do they show signs of redaction, and if so, for what purpose has the redaction apparently been made? Abundant illustration of growth and redaction of tradition is to be found in the account of the Exodus from Egypt and the entrance into the land of Canaan, and that portion which requires consideration in these notes may serve

[1] Kuenen, "The Critical Method," in the *Modern Review*, I (1880), p. 705.

to exemplify methods which naturally were not restricted to the Pentateuch.

From the results of the critical analysis it will be obvious that many centuries intervened between the age to which these events are attributed and that in which the narratives reached their present form. It has been placed beyond all reasonable doubt that they extend down into the post-exilic period, and it is necessary to bear in mind that the final redaction was made subsequent to the religious regeneration of Israel after the return from the exile. The writings of a Nehemiah or of an Ezra throw only incomplete light upon the internal movements of this post-exilic age—at the epoch when most is to be expected, the relevant records are slight—but we may look for the Judaism of that period in the contemporary re-writing and redaction of the old traditions with as much confidence as we may treat the "Little Genesis" or Book of Jubilees as material for the internal thought of a few centuries later. Hence, it is found that, for the purposes of critical study, the post-exilic records and the post-exilic narratives of the Exodus and Conquest illustrate one another and are mutually supplementary.

Now, if the return from the exile was fresh in the minds of post-exilic writers, this was only one of the great issues in the history of Israel which could exercise influence upon the course of tradition. Even within the body of P itself, there are signs of important modifications, and it is almost impossible to estimate with any certainty how many currents of thought had previously affected the traditions of the great national event. There is sufficient evidence that the founding of the nation was an epoch to which later ages ascribed the initiation of their institutions, so that the narratives became the vehicle for the views and ideals of later generations. Of earlier stages, the Deuteronomic reform is the one that can be most clearly traced, and one is thereby entitled to assume that earlier changes in Hebrew religion and thought must have left their mark *somewhere* upon the earlier writings. Thus, one is compelled to believe that the influence of such a movement as that associated with Elijah and Elisha would assuredly affect any records which existed in writing in their age.

But it would be a mistake to suppose that it is only in religion and ethics that we are to expect modification and development. A considerable amount of fluctuation is to be found in the narratives (that is, in the history from the view-point of the writers); some of the variations in important details are very striking, and when one considers the differences between the Deuteronomic and post-exilic traditions it is scarcely likely that the many centuries which separate even the former (D) from the events themselves have not witnessed

equally noteworthy developments. There was time enough for boundaries to shift, and for the familiar sites to be the scene of other movements, for tribes to grow and to die out, and for tribal traditions to be grafted on to one and the same national stock[1]. But when the attempt is made to investigate the traditions in their earlier pre-Deuteronomic form, many almost insoluble difficulties at once present themselves, and whilst we can utilize the evidence of Deuteronomy to estimate the work of the latest redaction (P), for the extent of earlier revisions we must depend upon internal evidence and general considerations of continuity and the like.

Now, one is so accustomed to consider the detour to the south of the Sinaitic peninsula as an integral stage in the Exodus from Egypt that many only half-concealed indications which point to a different tradition are often apt to be overlooked. The itinerary of forty stations in Num. xxxiii (agreeing with the number of the years of wandering) is so freely admitted by modern critics to be one of P's lists, that it cannot claim the attention which it has so often received, and any theory of the Israelite route, instead of relying upon the characteristically dry and lifeless enumeration (familiar enough in P's writings), should concern itself primarily with the older and more lively narratives with their description of the events of the march. A brief consideration of these is necessary[2].

The incidents, taken *seriatim*, comprise the following:—

(*a*) Immediately after the destruction of Pharaoh's army in the *Yam Sûph*, the Israelites proceed to the wilderness of Shur and march three days without finding water. On reaching *Mârâh* ("bitter") the waters were found to be undrinkable and were sweetened, and *there*—a change of source has been suspected—a statute and judgment (מִשְׁפָּט) were given, and he (i.e. Yahweh) *tested him* (נִסָּהוּ). This reference to Shur (Exod. xv. 22 sqq.) brings us at once to a familiar district, associated with Hagar (Gen. xvi. 7)[3] and with Abraham (xx. 1); one which, from the parallel story of Isaac (xxvi. 1), at some

[1] The topographical questions alone are serious when one recalls the Goshen in Egypt and S. Palestine; the Yam Sûph in the Aelanite Gulf; the possibility of the extension of the name Muṣri-Mizraim beyond the borders of Egypt, and the surely not infrequent incursions of tribes from north Arabia.

[2] For full critical details reference must be made to recent critical literature; special mention may be made of Addis, *Doc. of Hexateuch*; Bacon, *Triple Trad. of the Exodus*; G. F. Moore, "Exodus" and "Numbers" (in *Encyc. Bib.*); G. B. Gray, *Numbers*; and Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *The Hexateuch*, vol. ii (here referred to as *Hex.*).

[3] In the parallel narrative, Hagar is on the point of dying of thirst (Gen. xxi. 15 sqq.).

period, at least, was regarded as belonging to the Philistines (notice Exod. xiii. 17). Further, it is important to observe that the wilderness of Shur was evidently part of the district occupied by the Amalekites (1 Sam. xv. 7, xxvii. 8), and that the scene of the law-giving in question is evidently in the neighbourhood of Kadesh (see Gen. xvi. 7, 14), if not at Kadesh itself. For Kadesh, as its name En-mishpat ("well of judgment," Gen. xiv. 7) shows, seems to have been famous as an ancient centre of legislation, and the suggestion that, according to one tradition, the Israelites journeyed direct to Kadesh finds some support in Judges xi. 16, in the specific allusion to the "testing," and in a number of other points of detail which will be noticed below. This being so, it is noteworthy that the period of three days agrees precisely with the intention expressed in Exod. v. 3, viii. 27 (cp. iii. 18).

(*b*) It is to P that Exod. xvi in its present form is due, but it is undeniably based upon old material, and provides an interesting example of the manipulation (and mutilation) of existing tradition. The fact that the manna was sent to *test* (נסה, ver. 4) the people to see whether they would walk in the Law presupposes a law-giving, and indirect allusions to the ark (vers. 32–34) and sanctuary (ver. 9; in ver. 10 for "wilderness") point to a later context. In fact, recent critics agree that the whole episode is based upon a duplicate of the incidents recorded in Num. xi, and should follow the Sinaitic covenant. The gift of manna belongs most naturally to the later wanderings in the desert (cp. Deut. viii. 3 and 16). See below (*i*).

(*c*) A similar displacement has been effected in the account of the miracle performed at Massah and Meribah. P locates it at Rephidim, xvii. 1 *a*, whilst a glossator has anticipated by the insertion of "in Horeb," ver. 6. The whole passage is composite, and the problem is complicated by the very close relation to Num. xx. 1–13. In the latter story, however, the scene is Meribah, to be identified with Kadesh (Num. xx. 1, 13, xxvii. 14; cp. Meribath-Kadesh, Ezek. xlvii. 19, xlviii. 28), whereas the source incorporated in Deut. ix. 22 (cp. vi. 16) treats Massah as a distinct name. The union of the two names in Exod. xvii. 7 appears to have arisen from the fusion of two sources in which Massah in the one case, and Meribah in the other, were associated with a similar story. But whilst there can be no doubt that Meribah ("contention" or "striving") is properly a Kadesh locality, there is only a very strong presumption that Massah ("testing," "proving," &c.) belonged originally to the same district[1].

[1] Note above in (*a*) the proving or "testing" associated with the "judgment."

For the present, however, it is at least clear from a comparison of Deut. ix. 22 with Num. xi that any allusion to Massah is out of place in its present context.

(*d*) The account of the defeat of Amalek in xvii. 8–16 is due to E—probably a secondary source[1]—and like the preceding episodes is marked by certain peculiarities which indicate a much later point in the narratives: Moses is no longer able to sustain the outstretched rod, and Joshua, formally introduced in xxxiii. 11 as a young man in attendance upon Moses, is now a trained captain. The relation between the two, therefore, represents a more advanced stage, *after* the institution of the Tent of Meeting. In addition to this, the mention of Amalek associates itself with Num. xiv, where the Israelites are at Kadesh. Not in the peninsula of Sinai or near the Gulf of Akabah, but to the immediate south of Palestine does this people belong, and whilst we might expect to find them in the wilderness of Shur (*a* above), many critics agree that they are out of place in their present context[2].

(*e*) Even the composite account of Jethro's visit to Moses (Exod. xviii) cannot belong rightly to its present context. Although the scene is apparently Rephidim (unidentified, xvii. 8, xix. 2), ver. 5 places it at the "mount of God" (Horeb-Sinai, cp. already xvii. 6). But the narrative implies a settled encampment and the possession of laws; its tenor suggests the last stage in the sojourn at Horeb, and it is significant that this is precisely the point at which the tradition in Deuteronomy (i. 9–17) assigns the institution of judges and officers[3]. So the usual critical view, but since the holy mountain was already near Jethro's home (iii. 1), his journey "unto the wilderness" (xviii. 5) and his return "unto his own land" (ver. 27) seem to imply that the original scene of this visit was not Sinai-Horeb. See further below on Num. x. 29 sqq. (*g*).

(*f*) The chapters that follow comprise the Sinaitic theophany, legislation, and covenant, continued by a mass of material, now of post-exilic date, which extends (Exod. xxxii–xxxiv excepted) from Exod. xxv to Num. x. 28. It has already been seen (*b*) that P builds upon old material[4], and it is important to bear in mind that even as

[1] Without the recognition of secondary sources in both J and E, the literary criticism of the Exodus can make no progress.

[2] In view of the repeated references to נִסָּה and מַסָּה, there is a possibility that the name of the altar Yahweh-nissi (נִסִּי) was thought to be connected with Massah.

[3] Note, however, the development of the tradition; Deut., l. c., makes no reference to the part played by Jethro.

[4] Cp. also P in Gen. xxxv, see pp. 57 foot, 58.

P's laws and institutions are not all of post-exilic origin, so his narratives may be the development of early tradition. For example, Exod. xxxiii. 7–11 abruptly introduces us to the Sacred Tent, a dwelling which cannot possibly be the elaborate building already described by P. Together with Deut. x. 1–5 and Num. x. 33, it presupposes some *old* preliminary explanation of the tent and ark, on which account it is extremely probable that P's sources in the preceding chapters have taken the place of older matter dealing with similar topics. Thus it will be seen that although P gives us the post-exilic representation of the older traditions, and although it is not always possible to determine precisely how much of his material is applicable to the earlier ages, his sources can be of great assistance in any attempt to reconstruct the general trend and context of early tradition[1]. In these circumstances, it will evidently be important to observe how P's source continues after his account of the preparations for the sanctuary. (See below, p. 76.)

(*g*) The older sources are resumed in Num. x. 29 sqq., where we once again meet with the father-in-law of Moses. This associates itself with the misplaced narrative, Exod. xviii (*e*), and it will be seen that if that chapter stood in the present context the internal difficulties (already noticed) would vanish. Both narratives agree in demonstrating the dependence of Moses upon his father-in-law, and the relative antiquity of Num. x. 29 sqq. shows itself most prominently when it is compared with Exod. xxxiii, where it is not a human

[1] Similarly, although the chronicler writes in accordance with the religious standpoint of his age to such an extent that his records are of little value for the study of religious life under the monarchy, it would be uncritical to reject the traditions he has re-written or incorporated without subjecting them first to careful and unbiassed investigation. And in criticizing his historical evidence it is necessary to bear in mind the scantiness of our earlier historical sources. The Book of Kings itself contains only a selection from the material accessible to the compilers, and there is no sound reason why certain portions of the Book of Chronicles should not be based upon or developed from equally reputable sources. If the conviction can be maintained that P, however unhistorical in his present form, has *developed* rather than *invented*, it will be difficult to deny that the chronicler has proceeded upon the same lines. On general grounds, moreover, it seems unreasonable to suppose that a writer should take the trouble to invent, when a mass of tradition (whether oral or written) must have been in circulation. Not to pronounce upon the credibility of individual points of evidence, but to collect and classify all related material, must be the first step in historical study, and it is, perhaps, too often assumed that the earlier books are necessarily more credible than the later.

but a divine guide whose help is required. In spite of its brevity it is of unique value, since Hobab's clan is subsequently met with in Judges i. 16, whence it appears that in spite of his disinclination he was induced to accompany the wanderers. The passage is properly a torso; it breaks off with tantalizing suddenness, and only allows us to infer that some account of Hobab's journey once existed in writing and that this record has been superseded in favour of another by some early editor[1]. The passage undoubtedly belongs to the same context as *f* (Exod. xxxii–xxxiv) and the scene must be Sinai-Horeb (ver. 33), but Hobab's proposal to depart to his own "land" and "kindred" (מוֹלֶדֶת) agrees with Exod. xviii. 27, and tends to deepen the impression that the original scene was neither Sinai nor Horeb. Even P's narrative in Num. x. 12[2] states that the wilderness of Sinai had been left and that the Israelites were in the wilderness of Paran, and although this source seems to have located the latter to the south of Kadesh (but cp. xiii. 3 and 26), there are some indications that this is merely to give effect to a particular view which is not original. In point of fact, the narratives now under consideration are the result of a peculiarly complicated process; it is not enough to agree with many recent critics that *a–e* are misplaced, it is also necessary to observe how persistently incidents are placed at a stage before Kadesh is reached when definite features suggest that their original position was at Kadesh itself.

Several important events have been crowded into Num. xi. No details are preserved of (*h*) the "burning" at Tab'erah (תַּבְעֵרָה, Num. xi. 1–3), but the reference has every appearance of being based upon the meaning of the place-name. Such aetiological allusions (cp. Massah, Meribah and Marah) in other fields of historical investigation would naturally be treated with great reserve[3].

(*i*) In the composite narrative of the manna and quails, the institution of the seventy elders is to be kept quite distinct, its relation to portions of Exod. xxxiii being indisputable. The story (which serves to explain the name "Graves of Lust") is evidently akin to P's narrative in Exod. xvi, and both ignore the view that the Israelites were supplied with herds and flocks (Exod. xvii. 3, xix. 13,

[1] The meaning of the "three days" in Num. x. 33 is obscure, but cp. Exod. xv. 22 (see end of *a*).

[2] Vers. 13–28 being secondary (see *Hex.*, p. 200), vers. 11, 12, or their original, once stood immediately before ver. 29.

[3] On the assumption that an early source recounted an appropriate incident one might be tempted to refer to the story of Nadab and Abihu (Lev. x. 1–5), or of Korah's revolt (Num. xvi), but these are at present in a different context, and of post-exilic origin. See, however, below.

xxiv. 5, xxxii. 6, xxxiv. 3, Num. xx. 19). The tradition in Deut. ix. 22 refers to acts of provocation at Taberah, Massah and Kibroth-hattaavah, and since the last is clearly connected with the provision of quails it is extremely probable that the gift of manna was originally associated with Massah. That Exod. xvi. 4 contains a specific allusion to the *testing* or *proving* of Israel has already been seen [1].

(*j*) The next decisive incident is the sending of the spies (xiii. sq.), the scene of which is Kadesh (xiii. 26, Deut. i. 19, 46) [2]. This should hold good, also, of the revolt of Korah (xvi. sqq.), and is explicitly stated in the case of Num. xx (see *k*). But according to P, Kadesh is reached for the first time in xx. 1, and for this and other reasons some transposition of the narratives may be suspected. By placing the sending of the spies after the revolt and before xx. 14 sqq. a more natural sequence is obtained, and the account of the unsuccessful attempt to push northwards is thus followed by the preparations for the journey through Edom [3].

(*k*) In Num. xx is recorded a story of "striving," a duplicate of that in Exod. xvi. 1–7 (see *c*). In some obscure manner Moses and Aaron did not *sanctify* (קדשׁ) Yahweh in the eyes of Israel, whence the place was called the "waters of Meribah" because the children of Israel "strove" (רִבָּה) with Yahweh, and he showed his holiness among them" (ויקדשׁ בם)—an unmistakable allusion to the name Kadesh. It is difficult to determine from the narrative the nature of the sin of which Moses and Aaron were guilty. Cornill has suggested that it was some act of open rebellion and takes the words "hear, ye rebels" in ver. 10 to have been addressed originally by Yahweh to the leaders. There is also a possibility that the story with its allusion to rebels (מֹרִים) was associated with Marah (מָרָה, see above, *a*), but in the nature of the case this cannot be proved [4]. However, there are other allusions to offences by Moses and Aaron, and on inspection it is found that all appear to be related in an extremely perplexing manner. For example, from Deut. i. 37 it seems that in one tradition Moses incurred

[1] From another nuance of the root comes the idea of "tempting," to which Deut. vi. 16 and Ps. lxxviii. 18 refer.

[2] According to Deut. i. 22 the spies were sent at the request of the people; contrast Num. xiii. 1.

[3] xxi. 1–3 (Israelite *victory* at Hormah) and the overtures to Edom are intimately connected as regards subject-matter with xiv. 41 sqq. (*defeat* at Hormah) and ver. 25. See also Bacon, p. 182 sq. The present position of *k* (before the attempt to pass Edom) finds a parallel in Exod. xvii, where its duplicate *c* precedes the defeat of Amalek. The relative value of these traditions is another question, on which see below.

[4] However, in Exod. xv. 23 sqq., the giving of the statute and judgment follows upon the miracle at Marah (where the waters are sweetened).

the wrath of Yahweh on the return of the spies. Now since the latter event should probably be placed before xx. 14, it would thus occupy the same relative position as the story of Meribah in xx. 1–13. There is no hint of any offence of Moses in Num. xiv, as the narrative now stands, but it seems to imply that sentence had already been passed upon both Moses and Aaron. On the other hand, the chapter contains a fine description of his intercession on behalf of the rebellious people. The passage in question (Num. xiv. 11–24) has close literary contact with Exod. xxxii–xxxiv, and it is curious that the parallels occur in the account of the intercession of Moses after Aaron made the calf. These scenes, like the above, precede the commencement of *a* journey (Num. x. 29 sqq.), and from Deut. ix. 20 it would appear that, according to some tradition, the mediation was on behalf of Aaron. It may be that opinion was not settled regarding the specific occasion on which the divine displeasure was aroused, but there are evident signs that the traditions are not so widely separated as they at first appear.

This necessarily very brief survey will exemplify the intricate character of the narratives. There has been considerable adjustment and many stages in the growth of tradition have been preserved by the editors. Although *a* (above, p. 64) brings us at once to a law-giving in the wilderness of Shur, no covenant or legislation can reasonably be expected until Sinai-Horeb is reached. The narratives Exod. xvi–xix demand a position *after* the laws, and, although they are distributed along the route, Sinai is already the scene in xvii. 6 and xviii. 5. Subsequently it is found that although the spies are sent from Kadesh (Num. xiii. 26), this place is not yet reached in P (xx. 1), and although the incidents in Numbers (*g*, &c.) are placed either at Kadesh or on the journey thither, some points of contact with Exod. xxxii–xxxiv (apparently Sinai-Horeb) have already been found.

Although it is more than probable that certain incidents have been misplaced, it is difficult to reconstruct the form of the sources before they suffered adjustment. Nevertheless, it is clear that the connexion between the allied passages was a close one: the rock in Exod. xvii. 6 is that mentioned in Num. xx. 8; the hill in Exod. xvii. 10 finds its explanation in the allusions in Num. xiv. 40, 44, and P, in Exod. xvi, builds upon older material closely related to that which has survived in Num. xi[1]. That these variants can supplement or illustrate each

[1] As a specimen of intricacy it may be noticed also that from Deut. viii. 3 and 16 one expects the manna to have been sent after the Israelites had left Kadesh and were in the "great and terrible wilderness," and certainly Num. xi is preceded by the account of the commencement of the journey (see *g* and above). But Exod. xxxii–xxxiv is apparently at

other appears notably when it is remembered that before the incorporation of P's material, Exod. xxxii–xxxiv stood in close connexion with Num. x. 29–36, xi. sqq. The passages in the former which describe the reluctance of Moses to bear the burden of the people are of the same stamp as Num. xi. 12, 14 sq., and it is only necessary to observe how appropriately these verses follow upon Exod. xxxiii. 1–3 to admit the force of Bacon's reasoning that this was their original position[1]. This affords another example of the manner in which the account of the journey has been constructed, and it now becomes evident that many traditions have grown up around the commencement of *this* journey. The relation of Exod. xviii to Num. x. 29 has already been noticed (see *e* and *g*), and one is entitled to infer that the former must have been found in this context at some earlier stage in the literary history of the narratives. If it be transferred (allowance being made for redaction), not only do its difficulties disappear but we are in agreement with the tradition represented in Deut. i. 9–18, which has verbal points of contact with *both* Exod. xviii and Num. xi[2]. Accordingly, we find that as a necessary preliminary to the journey, Moses requests the assistance of Hobab, that Jethro suggests steps to lighten the legislative duties of his son-in-law (note the special development of this in Deut. i), and that as tradition strikes a loftier note, Moses needs a divine guide, and, no longer the judge, but the recipient of the divine spirit, elects seventy elders[3].

All these appear to represent successive stages in the growth of tradition, and since traces of displacement have already been found it is possible that other passages originally stood in this context. The relation of Exod. xxiv. 1, 2, 9–11 to the election of the seventy elders in Num xi is not certain[4], but the former appears to represent a more primitive version of the incident, and some support for this belief might be found if it could be shown that Nadab and Abihu

Sinai-Horeb, and Kadesh is not reached until Num. xiii. And, finally, does the need for this food belong to the oldest traditions? See also the references above in *i*.

[1] See also Gray, p. 107.

[2] See Driver, *Deut.*, p. 10; Addis, ii. p. 34 sq.

[3] Note, further, the general idea of the reluctance of the leader to undertake the task; one may compare the account of Elijah at Horeb. The examples of development noticed above are especially instructive since elsewhere, where similar growth is to be expected, only isolated stages may have survived. Any narrative that happens to stand by itself may represent perhaps only one of several different views which were once current.

[4] See Gray, p. 116.

once had a place in the context of Exod. xxxii–xxxiv (see below, p. 77).

Another incident that presumably belongs before the commencement of the journey is the story of the punishment of Miriam and the vindication of Moses (Num. xii)[1]. Notwithstanding its present position at Hazeroth (xi. 35, xii. 16), it associates itself with the visit of Jethro to Moses, and is characterized by that motive of jealousy which underlies the story of the seventy elders (xi. 28 sq.). The idea of election and of the vindication of authority is met with in other passages which appear to belong to the same cycle, and it seems probable that this markedly advanced narrative of the punishment and forgiveness of Miriam is to be connected with the statement in an older source that Miriam died at Kadesh (xx. 1).

In like manner, it appears that although Aaron receives his punishment at Kadesh, one tradition knew of his narrow escape from death for his share in the matter of the golden calf, and even of Moses himself there is preserved in Exod. iv. 13–16 (at the mount of God) a curious allusion to the manifestation of Yahweh's anger in consequence of his reluctance to undertake the task imposed upon him[2]. It is singular that, although editors have succeeded in concealing the precise offence of which Moses was guilty in Num. xx, the tradition in Ps. cvi. 33 states that he was rash or indiscreet (בִּשְׂא) at Meribah, whereas the passages which seem to hint at this are now in a context which points to Sinai.

A number of independent considerations (of varying value) tend to the view that a fundamental adjustment of the oldest traditions has been effected. Light is thrown upon this by a literary critical result of extreme importance. There is reason to believe that according to P the whole of the forty years' wanderings was spent away from Kadesh; in D, likewise, the greater part of the time is spent in the inhospitable desert, whereas in the earlier sources the Israelites have their centre in the fertile and well-watered oasis of Kadesh surrounded by pasture-grounds suitable for nomads. Many details are obscure, but the dominant fact is the conclusion that Kadesh was once regarded as the permanent centre of the people[3]. Hence

[1] Bacon, p. 175; Gray, pp. 98, 120.

[2] This reluctance and the promised help of Aaron the Levite may be associated with the selection of the Levites in general (Exod. xxxii. 25 sqq.), which is now placed at Sinai-Horeb. On historical grounds the latter may be the more primitive, the choice of Aaron as the representative of the Levites may mark a more advanced stage.

[3] See Gray, *Encyc. Bib.*, "Wanderings, Wilderness of," especially §§ 6, 15 sq.

it would be natural to assume that it occupied a very prominent place in the old sources, and it seems more likely that traditions would gather around it than around Sinai-Horeb, which was the scene of only a comparatively short stay. Now, if the old sources described the preparations for the commencement of the journey from Kadesh—and it is extremely probable on *a priori* grounds that they would—there is further presumption for the view that the stories of visits of a Jethro or Hobab, and of the reluctance of Moses, and all allied incidents were originally associated with this historic site, and that the present adjustment was intended to magnify the importance of Sinai-Horeb and to treat Kadesh merely as one of the stages in this part of the journey (see below, p. 78).

It is scarcely necessary to show that the Sinaitic covenant and legislation is more advanced than the germ of the old laws in Exod. xxxiv. The latter's theophany is more primitive than that in Exod. iii and there is a distinct stamp of antiquity underlying Exod. xxxii–xxxiv which is not without significance. At present, everything is made to depend upon the story of the golden calf: the apostasy is followed by the divine wrath, the choice of the Levites, and apparently a *new* covenant. But the offence must be understood in the light of the later polemics against calf-worship and on this account can scarcely be regarded as part of the original tradition[1]. At one time, however, some other motive must have existed, although when we consider the time that has elapsed between the date of the old account of the choice of the Levites and the latest redactions one can hardly expect to be able to recover the earliest details.

The leading features are (*a*) Aaron's share in the offence, and (*b*) the institution of the sacred tribe Levi. The latter was evidently once narrated at some length, since in Deut. x. 8[2] it is associated with the making of the ark and thus presupposes an account which is *not* the existing one in Exod. xxviii sq. (cp. Lev. viii), but probably an earlier, from which P has been developed. Now, from the "Blessing of Moses" it seems that a tradition existed that Yahweh "proved" the Levites at Massah and "strove" with them at the waters of Meribah (Deut. xxxiii. 8–11). The passage is not free from obscurity, but since it alludes to the separation of the Levites from brother and son (ver. 9, cp. Exod. xxxii. 27, 29) and implies some creditable performance, it is remarkable that it should associate the account in Exod. xxxii with the present story of Meribah in Num. xx. It must seem extremely singular that Meribah, famous for

[1] Possibly the story is not earlier than the time of Hezekiah.

[2] Deut. x. 6–7 have come in from another source, but the effect of the insertion is to place the event *after* Aaron's death.

some obscure offence of Moses and Aaron, should also be the scene of the institution of the Levites, and although the surviving traditions are incomplete they appear to be linked together by some definite bond. It is noteworthy that even in Exod. xxxii Aaron is blamed for the calf-worship and, according to Deut. ix. 20, would have perished but for the mediation of Moses. But the present narratives (Exod. l. c.) treat it as the sin of the whole people, and in the account of the intercession of Moses there are literary points of contact with the story of the spies (see above). Further, in Deut. i. 36 sq. Moses incurs the wrath of Yahweh on the return of the spies. Already, on the strength of Deut. xxxiii alone, we could infer that parts at least of Exod. xxxii–xxxiv were originally located at Kadesh, and if this evidence associates Levites with Meribah, it brings them into a context before Num. xx. 14 sqq., and places them in the same relation to it as the story in Num. xiii–xiv[1]! It would seem that it is only on the assumption that cycles of tradition, of different dates, originally encircling Kadesh, have been used to construct the present narratives and have been placed now at Sinai-Horeb and now at other stations along the route, that these phenomena admit of explanation.

It will be seen that the considerations which go to support this view proceed from a study of the subject-matter—the purely literary questions are extremely intricate. Here and there one can trace fairly clearly the development of the literary material[2], but it is extremely difficult to understand why D's account of the calf-worship (ix. 26 sqq.) should link together passages associated with the present stories of Korah's rebellion and the sending of the spies[3]. It may, indeed, be urged that this is the result of intentional rearrangement, or of mere reminiscence, or, again, it may be that in the early fluctuating state of tradition passages were connected now with one

[1] P, moreover, relates the death of Aaron in Num. xx. 24 sqq., and the result of the insertion of Deut. x. 6 sq. is to associate his decease with the separation of Levites. In Exod. iv. 13, when Moses had in some way aroused the wrath of Yahweh, Aaron is promised as a help, and in the story of the spies Caleb is the only one to escape punishment. To Caleb, later tradition adds Joshua, and in Exod. xvii the Massah and Meribah story (*c*) is followed by an event (*d*) in which Joshua, Aaron, and Hur (a Calebite, 1 Chron. ii. 19) play a prominent part. We shall find other cases of selection and rejection in the account of the revolt of Korah (see below); and it will be necessary subsequently to show that a relation subsisted between such apparently heterogeneous names as Caleb, Korah, Moses, Aaron, and the Levites.

[2] As in the insertion of Deut. x. 6 sq. (above).

[3] Num. xiv. 16, xvi. 13; see, for example, the table in *Hex.*, p. 262; Driver, *Deut.*, p. 112.

and now with another of the events before the departure from Kadesh. At all events, whatever be the true cause, there is some reason for the supposition that the revolt of Korah was once intimately associated with the context of Exod. xxxii–xxxiv, and this story of rejection and selection seems clearly related to events which are located now at Sinai-Horeb, but originally in all probability belonged to Kadesh.

The critical analysis of Num. xvi sqq. has brought to light a fusion of interesting narratives all marked by the same motive: the confirmation of authority or prerogative. The composite story of Dathan and Abiram was evidently known to the writer of Deut. xi. 6 as a distinct incident, and a careful examination of the evidence shows that it deals with a dispute against the civil authority of Moses. With this has been woven an account of Korah's rebellion, also composite, with very clear evidence for the presence of two distinct views. In one (*a*), Korah and his followers protest against the Levitical rights enjoyed by Moses and Aaron; the malcontents themselves are not Levites (in Num. xxvii. 3, it is assumed that Manassites could have been included), and the sequel is intended to uphold the pre-eminence of the tribe of Levi against the rest of Israel. But in the other narrative (*b*), Korah and other Levites lay claim to serve as priests upon an equality with Aaron; the point at issue is not Levites *versus* laity, but the right to the priesthood, which is now secured for Aaron and his seed alone.

Now, both *a* and *b* are clearly due to P and it does not need to be shown that *b* is merely a later development of *a* in accordance with the development of hierarchical institutions. But the very circumstance that a post-exilic writer has supplemented *a* in order to find a precedent for the degradation of the Levites is a noteworthy sign, inasmuch as it is by no means improbable that *a* itself represents the results of previous development. The study of the Levitical institutions, taken with the internal features of the Levitical genealogies, is enough to show that there were many stages before the schemes reached their present finished state, and since it has been found that the traditions of the wanderings have developed upon definite lines, we are perhaps entitled to argue that if the *late* narratives have so much to say in Num. xvi sq. regarding the Levites of the *later* ages, the *earlier* records were not silent regarding their *earlier* fortunes. Moreover, since it has been seen that related subjects were treated in the same context and have subsequently suffered rearrangement and adjustment, there is a strong presumption that the existing narratives in Num. xvi sq. should be closely connected with the account of the Levites in Exod. xxxii. In point of fact, it is found that Num. xvi sq. stands in a position locating the

incident at Kadesh[1], and that this was also the scene of Exod. xxxii. 25 sqq. can be argued on independent grounds (see Deut. xxxiii. 8 sq.).

When, further, we proceed to consider the general trend of P's complete narratives we find an interesting analogy. The post-exilic passages, it must be remembered, are not of one strain, and whilst they appear to represent the normal development of earlier traditions in some cases, in others they show signs of specific modification in accordance with post-exilic ritual. Now, the first seven chapters of Leviticus form a group by themselves and interrupt the connexion between Exod. xxxv–xl and Lev. viii (itself an expansion), and the main thread of P, which ceases in Exod. xxix, is resumed in Lev. ix.[2] Accordingly, if we confine ourselves to the self-contained post-exilic cycle, we find the following sequence: the arrangements for the tabernacle[3], the sacred vestments for Aaron and his sons and the consecration of the priests. Next, the original account of the construction of the tabernacle and of the consecration of the Aaronites has been replaced by an amplified account, of secondary origin, and upon this follows the offering of the first sacrifices (Lev. ix). Finally, immediately after this the two eldest sons offend against the ritual by offering unhallowed fire in their censers and are consumed by Yahweh's flame (Lev. x).

There is no doubt that this continuous record presents another stage in the history of the priesthood. It is no longer the supremacy of Levites over laity or of Aaronites over Levites, but of the younger of Aaronite divisions over the older "sons." Aaron's position is assured, and the conflicts which mark the subsequent (but earlier) narratives are virtually presupposed. It is only necessary to observe the sequence and to consider the relative position of allied incidents to infer that this record has been based upon older sources referring to events before the journey was undertaken. We have already seen that the older description of the tent of meeting and the account of its construction (there presupposed) was in close connexion with the old account of the institution of the Levites, and it seems to be not improbable that as the hierarchy developed, the traditions developed simultaneously. Hence, if we can assume a number of traditions (of different ages) proceeding upon the same general lines,

[1] P's theory, that the Israelites had not reached Kadesh (see Num. xx. 1) does not affect the argument.

[2] See Addis, ii. 290 sq.; *Hex.* p. 152; G. F. Moore, *Encyc. Bib.*, col. 2777.

[3] Its ark, table, and candlestick remind us of the equipment of the ordinary chamber; cp. 2 Kings iv. 10 (but that the ark was originally a throne or seat, like כִּסֵּא in the passage in Kings, is far from certain).

we may conjecture that the story of the two sons of Aaron and also that of Korah occupied the same relative position. In fact, Bacon has already suggested that Nadab and Abihu were the original offenders in the story of the election of the Levites, and since the names occur in an old source it is extremely probable that some older and fuller record of them existed[1].

It is at least interesting that when the two sons were devoured by the divine fire, Moses quotes the words of Yahweh: "I will show myself holy (אֶקָּדֵשׁ) in them that are nigh unto me" (Lev. x. 3). These words find an echo in Num. xx. 12 sq. on the occasion of the punishment of Moses and Aaron at *Kadesh*, and that the writer in that passage is playing upon the name is beyond dispute. Since the story of Nadab and Abihu belongs to a context which appears originally to have belonged to Kadesh, it is not improbable that the words of Moses are another play upon the name. Further, the nature of the offence of the Aaronites associates itself with the revolt of Korah in the fact that when Yahweh distinguishes the holy and chooses those who may approach him, Korah and his company are ordered to offer fire in their censers. The allusion to the selection and the sequel of the incident imply that there was some test whereby the Korahites were severed from the rest of the people, but the sources are incomplete, although the evident importance of the censers (Num. xvi. 36 sqq.) suggests some closer connexion with Lev. x. 1–5 at an earlier stage[2].

It will now perhaps be clear that we possess a complex of stories, some of a distinct prophetic stamp (Num. xi. 24–29, xii), whilst others are associated more closely with priestly standpoints. To give these passages the attention they deserve would necessitate a complete survey of the history of Israel. What is important for the present purpose is to lay emphasis upon the unmistakable and orderly progress of tradition in conformity with the actual development of Israelite institutions. As already indicated, the superiority of Levites over the people gives expression to an historic fact, and in the

[1] Accordingly there would be some support for the view that Exod. xxiv. 1, 2, 9–11 (where they are brought before God) is the account of their election, corresponding to the election of the Levites (see also above, p. 71 sq.). It is possible, moreover, that when the account of the wanderings was constructed, some such story as this was once associated with the "burning" at Taberah (see *h*, above).

[2] This would explain the insertion of Num. xv, with its laws on burnt-offerings, &c., and since the position of Eleazar (xvi. 37) presupposes the death of his elder brothers, it might be intelligible why this event is not noted here, but is duly mentioned elsewhere; see iii. 4, xxvi. 61 (cp. also 1 Chron. xxiv. 2).

supremacy of Aaronites over Levites, and in the elevation of certain Aaronite divisions over others, we are able to recognize that later changes in the hierarchy have been reflected in the story of the nation's birth. On the analogy of the Levitical genealogies we are entitled to expect an earlier stage where Mosaic divisions were supplanted by Aaronite, and evidence for this is actually found. Accordingly, we are entitled to consider further whether there could not be found other early stages which would illustrate the Mosaic divisions and the origin of the Levites[1].

For the present, there seems to be sufficient evidence for the conclusion[2] that Kadesh was the original objective of the wanderings of the Israelites, not after the digression to Sinai, but after crossing the Yam Sûph; it was also the original scene of the legislation, and of the incidents (at all events in their oldest form) now distributed over the route.

The present prominence of Sinai-Horeb must be connected, it would seem, with the insertion of the body of laws in Exod. xx–xxiii. Misplaced incidents lead up to the relatively advanced material there incorporated, whilst heavily redacted passages (comprising relatively ancient theophany, laws, and institutions), have the appearance of belonging to the same context, but in reality belong to Kadesh. So far from assuming that Sinai-Horeb[3] is to be located in the immediate neighbourhood of Kadesh, the evidence of Exod. xiii. 17 seems to point conclusively in another direction. According to this verse, the Israelites did not journey by the land of the Philistines lest they should repent at the sight of war, and this must imply some detour (to the south of the Sinaitic peninsula or to Midian), since no sooner did they reach the wilderness of Shur (in the district of Kadesh) than they were in the very region to be avoided and conflicts actually ensued (*a* above). This suggests that when the secondary tradition with its later laws (on Sinai-Horeb) found a place in the history, it was introduced by means of Exod. xiii. 17 sq., and that incidents and passages originally relating to Kadesh were used

[1] That certain of the Levitical divisions were derived from names associated with Moses is clear (see *Encyc. Bib.*, col. 1665). Now in Exod. iv. 13–16, before Moses receives the promise of the help of Aaron the Levite, he incurs in some obscure manner the wrath of Yahweh. The latter detail associates itself, as has been seen, with the pre-eminence of Caleb (Deut. i. 36 sq.), and again with the institution of the Levites. It will be necessary, therefore, to consider whether, on independent grounds, any relation can be found between Caleb, Moses, and the Levites.

[2] Already urged by Wellhausen (*Prolegomena*, p. 343), H. P. Smith (*O. T. Hist.*, pp. 62, 69), and others, but here developed.

[3] The possibility that these were two distinct places must be allowed.

to build up the account of the detour from the Yam Sûph to Sinai and from Sinai to Kadesh. To argue that the holy mountain was near Kadesh is difficult in the face of Exod. xiii. 17, and the data by which the view has been supported are far from conclusive. If a people whose goal lay northwards from Egypt marched in any other direction it seems safer to admit conflicting traditions than to attempt to reconcile them [1].

Several instructive lessons regarding the methods of editors can be gleaned from a consideration of the foregoing narratives [2], but the chief point which it is desired to emphasize in this section is the great prominence of Kadesh, and its stories of "striving" in early tradition.

[1] A distinction should properly be drawn between events originally located at Kadesh and those which are due to the secondary tradition and rightly belong to Sinai-Horeb. But it is not easy to see how much really belongs to the latter. The "priests which come near to Yahweh" (Exod. xix. 22) imply an institution originally at Kadesh; on Exod. iv. 13–16, see above (p. 72). Deuteronomy, it will have been noticed, at times refers to traditions which are not those actually preserved in Exodus or Numbers, but very closely allied to them. Its isolated details prove how continuous was the work of redaction, and render the attempt to sketch the stages of development almost an impossibility. There has been too much action and reaction of traditions upon each other, and from these adjustments Deuteronomy itself is not free. It may be conjectured that one of the first steps was to represent Horeb or Sinai as the scene of events at Kadesh, and so, whilst Moses, Aaron, and Miriam suffer punishment or death at Kadesh, this is already anticipated by offences at Horeb or Hazeroth. The account of the journey from Horeb to Kadesh was then built up by borrowing narratives belonging to Kadesh, and so we find that Massah (properly associated with Meribah, i.e. Kadesh) becomes one of the stations. This form of the tradition lay before the author of Deut. ix. 22, but in his time the story of the calf differed from the present narrative in one remarkable detail (ibid. ver. 20). Along with this, there grew up the tradition of the dangers and perils of the wilderness which the Deuteronomic tradition places at one time between Horeb and Kadesh (i. 19) and at another time after the departure from Kadesh (viii. 15). From Deut. i. 9–17 it is evident that the narrative of the journey from Egypt to Horeb had not reached its present form (on Exod. xviii, see above, p. 71), and although xxv. 17–19 knows of the Amalekite hostility as Israel came out of Egypt, it mentions fresh details (ver. 18), does not appear to know of Israel's victory, and on internal grounds can hardly be due to the compiler.

[2] There are no *a priori* reasons why such methods should have been confined to the Pentateuch.

It has been concluded that the place where Jethro or Hobab came to visit Moses and the Israelites was evidently somewhat distant from his "land" and "kindred," and, therefore, was neither Sinai nor Horeb, but in all probability Kadesh. The commencement of the journey from Kadesh as narrated in Num. x. 29 sqq. is only a fragment, and has to be considered in the light of other related passages. Now in Num. xxi. 1–3, it is found that the journey has been continued successfully as far as Hormah, that is, about half-way from Kadesh to Beersheba. But at this point there is a sudden diversion, and henceforth the journey becomes a long detour round to the east of the Jordan. The traditions here become somewhat confused and contradictory. In the story of the spies, Caleb alone, in the oldest narrative, proves his faith, on which account he and his seed receive the promise of inheritance (Num. xiv. 24, cp. Deut. i. 36). But the rest of the people incur the displeasure of Yahweh and are punished, and when in defiance of his word and without the presence of the ark the attempt is made to press onwards, a severe defeat is inflicted upon them in the district of Hormah (xiv. 41–45). Next, an attempt is made to pass Edom, and a composite passage narrates (*a*) an unsuccessful embassy from Kadesh to the king of Edom, and (*b*) an armed resistance on the part of the Edomites apparently after Israel had started (xx. 14–22). At this stage, it is found necessary to turn back to the Yam Sûph (here obviously the Gulf of 'Akabah), and in agreement with the command already given in the story of the spies (xiv. 25), the journey is taken by the south end of Edom. The fluctuation of tradition already manifest is emphasized when it is observed that according to Deut. ii. 4, 9 Edom and Moab were passive, and that P seems to have supposed that Israel crossed the northern end of Edom[1]. It is important, therefore, to bear in mind the two main lines of route to Moab, the one from Kadesh, the other from the Yam Sûph. Even in Num. xxi, although the Israelites pass over the Arnon and reach Pisgah (vv. 16–20), in another representation they keep outside Moab (ver. 11 *b*); it is evident that the interpretation of these passages, as also of the defeat of Sihon the Amorite, depends upon the history of Moab and the known variation of its boundaries. The historical background, however, need not be considered here, and it is unnecessary to determine whether opportunity has not been seized in the chapters which follow to represent conditions of much later date. On the other hand, it is to be observed that the growth of the literary tradition of the Exodus is exemplified in the fact that the Balaam narratives (Num. xxii–xxiv), and P's supplementary material partly based upon them, break

[1] See Num. xxxiii, and Gray, *Numbers*, p. 282.

the connexion between the accounts of the conquest of the country east of the Jordan now preserved in Num. xxi and xxxii[1]. These events bring us to Shittim, the prelude to Joshua's conquest of Palestine from the east, where again a fresh cycle of tradition becomes prominent (cp. p. 57).

It is natural to infer that since so much emphasis is laid upon Caleb's faith, the traditions hardly made him share the punishment inflicted upon the rest of the people. Subsequently we find traces of independent efforts of Caleb (the clan) to settle in the neighbourhood of Hebron, and the clan of Hobab, who was invited to accompany Israel (from Kadesh), is subsequently found in the district of Arad, south of Hebron (Judges i). Hence there is a very strong probability that the successful start from Kadesh and the victory at Hormah led to a direct movement northwards, and that the clans or tribes which succeeded in reaching the stage mentioned in Num. xxi. 1–3 did *not* take any part in the journey round to the Jordan (see pp. 38 sqq., and below, pp. 89 sqq.).

It is not impossible that the fact that an initial reverse occurred at Hormah supplied the motive for the account of the disaster which is narrated in xiv. 41–45; although it might be preferable to regard the aim of the present chapter as an attempt to furnish an explanation of the lengthy detour. On the other hand, the tradition of the detour round by the Gulf of 'Akabah does not stand alone, and the intricacy of the literary evidence makes the problem of the forty years' delay almost hopeless. Kadesh could naturally be the starting-point for a journey northwards into Judah, or around the south end of the Dead Sea to the land of Moab, but a deliberate movement from Kadesh towards the Yam Sûph does not appear likely. Perhaps it may be suggested that it is an attempt to reconcile the above traditions (with Kadesh as centre) with the independent account of a journey from the Gulf of 'Akabah northwards into Moab.

The two leading traditions which underlie the history of Israel are those of an entry into Palestine, one from the south and the other from the east. With the former we can at present associate Caleb and the Kenites, in the latter Joshua is evidently the leading figure. These two views seem to have grown up separately, and there is evidence that each underwent a considerable amount of development. It is clear that the prevailing view of the conquest (cp. also

[1] *Old* fragments have been preserved in xxxii. 39–42. These deal with clans of Manasseh, and the same tribe comes to the fore in the post-exilic xxvii. The rest of xxxii narrates the request of Reuben and Gad to settle in the pasture-lands of Gilead. In view of the *possible* dependence of late passages upon earlier sources these contents are worthy of notice, and will be referred to later (p. 92).

Judges i) represents the tribal movements as part of a common undertaking after Gilgal had been reached. Whatever may be the original traditions of individual tribes or clans, when these become incorporated with other tribes which have their own traditions, many fundamental changes must ensue. Conflicting views are fused, attempts are made to effect a reconciliation, and several stages are traversed before final results are reached. The traditions of X may adapt themselves to Y, or the reverse; in the case of Caleb, the traditions of the less have simply become merged into that of the greater. In the traditions of the invasion of Palestine from the east we have a finished scheme, one which combines conflicting views and endeavours to harmonize them. But of the invasion from the south only isolated indications have survived and even these have not escaped rigorous treatment [1]. However, when it is related in Num. xxi. 1–3 that "Israel" took part in the capture of Hormah, it seems possible that the attempt was even made to generalize the "Calebite" tradition, and this tendency may appear again when Joshua finds a place in the story of the spies and takes part in the overthrow of Amalek (Ex. xvii. 8–16, a pale reflection of Num. xxi. 1–3) [2].

It remains now to consider the provisional epithet "Calebite" which has been attached to the tradition of the journey into Judah. What evidence is there for the constitution of the tribes or clans which made this journey? Already it has been seen that Caleb, one of the spies, appears later in the *negeb* of Judah, and the clan of the father-in-law of Moses, the nomad Kenites, are subsequently found, now in Judah and now in the north of Palestine at Kadesh-Naphtali. In P's narrative in Exod. xxxi. 2, we find that Bezalel ben Uri ben Hur takes part in the construction of the tabernacle. We have found that P's material cannot be wholly ignored, and on *a priori* grounds it could be conjectured that the notice is derived

[1] Observe the scantiness of Num. x. 29 sqq., and the treatment of Calebite traditions in Joshua xiv. 6–15, xv. 14–19 (above, p. 38 sq.).

[2] On the relation between (1) Num. xxi. 1–13 followed by the *successful* movement northwards (xxi. 1–3), and (2) the parallel story in Exod. xvii. 1–7 followed by the *defeat* of Amalek, see above, p. 69, n. 3. In Num. xxi. 1–3 the idea seems to be, not that Caleb entered from the east (as in Judges i), but that Israel accompanied Caleb northwards into Judah. In Num. xiv the inclusion of Joshua admits, naturally enough, of other explanations, although if it was thought that the future leader of the Israelites did not incur guilt when the spies were sent, it was forgotten that he evidently suffered the punishment of the forty years' delay. Some allowance must always be made for the possibility that passages were revised at a period when the "Calebite" tradition as a distinct movement had been suppressed.

from an older source[1]. It must be admitted that many of P's names are worthless as evidence for the period to which they are attached, but since Bezalel in 1 Chron. ii. 19 sq. is said to belong to the Calebites it seems extremely probable that P is trustworthy in this instance. For, it is not easy to see why the genealogist should invent this information; nay rather, his aim is obviously to incorporate Calebites among the descendants of Judah, and consequently the probability is that he is manipulating his evidence, and not fabricating it. There is no apparent reason why he should make Uri a grandson of Caleb unless the belief prevailed that Bezalel was a Calebite, and since P itself calls Bezalel a Judaean (in agreement with the *aim* of 1 Chron. ii), it seems justifiable to conclude that an earlier source (in agreement with the earlier representation) would have regarded the famous artificer as a member of the southern clan. That this would be extremely appropriate in the account of a "Calebite" migration is at once obvious. As regards his partner Aholiab the Danite, the evidence is more complicated, and must be viewed in the light of all the available evidence bearing upon the relations of Calebites and Kenites to other clans[2].

[1] Cp. the case of Nadab and Abihu.

[2] See above, p. 40, and below, p. 88.

VI. The Calebite Tradition.

At the close of the preceding section it was argued that a specific "Calebite" tradition could be traced in the story of the Exodus[1]. With Caleb is associated the kin of Moses' father-in-law, the Kenites, whose entrance into the extreme south of Judah belongs more naturally to a journey northwards from Kadesh than to any circular migration round by Shittim and Gilgal. At the first glance the term "Calebite," as applied to such a tradition, does not seem to be sufficiently comprehensive, but it is perhaps possible to show that the name became prominent (whence, probably its choice in the story of the spies), and the scattered details in the Old Testament suggest that it was more widely applied than is usually understood. At the outset, it is not difficult to find a certain appropriateness in the fact that the Kenites and Calebites are connected in tradition. A singular Judaean genealogy in 1 Chron. iv. 17 actually mentions a Miriam and a Jether (i. e. Jethro: cp. Exod. iv. 18) in a context which, although admittedly obscure in details, relates to Caleb (ver. 15 sq.). Caleb himself, as a Kenizzite, belongs to Edomite stock, and in the Edomite lists (Gen. xxxvi. 4, 17) we find the name Reuel, which is also that given, according to another version, to the father-in-law of Moses. Jether, too, recurs as Edomite in Gen. xxxvi. 40 (LXX for יְתֵת), comp. Ithran (יִתְרָן), ibid. ver. 26; and if the same name appears again in a Jerahmeelite genealogy (1 Chron. ii. 32), this only emphasizes the fact that, as Nöldeke states, "there are manifold traces of a mingling of Edomites and Horites with the neighbouring Israelite tribes[2]." Since it is found that Korah is said to be a "son" of Hebron (1 Chron. ii. 43) and is thus traditionally connected with Caleb, it is quite in accordance with the above view that in Gen. xxxvi. 5, &c., he is Edomite, and that in Num. xvi he enters prominently into one of the Kadesh narratives. And it follows from this that since the clans Caleb and Jerahmeel are spoken of as "brothers" and occupied seats

[1] Cp. Moore, *Encyc. Bib.*, col. 1443, par. v, who speaks of "a more primitive form of Judaean (or Calebite) tradition," according to which the Israelites, after crossing the Yam Sûph, proceeded direct to Kadesh.

[2] *Encyc. Bib.*, art. "Edom," § 3 end.

in close contiguity, it is possible that they shared the same fortunes throughout, or possessed similar traditions. On these grounds it is tempting to suppose that Peleth the father of On (Num. xvi. 1) is not to be separated from Peleth the Jerahmeelite (1 Chron. ii. 33)[1]. Without going into further detail, it may be stated that there is much evidence that some bond closely united the clans which became incorporated into Judah with those which lay further to the south and were ascribed to Edom (Gen. xxxvi). It is extremely difficult to comprehend clearly all the facts which this bond implies, but it may be inferred not only that some relationship was felt between them, but also that there were several clans apart from Calebites and Kenites which shared the tradition of a migration from Kadesh.

Now, it is only in the course of the growth of the story of Korah's revolt that he becomes a Levite. Originally, it is probable that he was regarded simply as a member of one of the southern clans. Unfortunately, little is known of the early history of the Levites, and although the prophecy in Gen. xlix. 5–7 reflects their scattered condition at the time when it was written, it is difficult to trace their rise. The possibility must be conceded that Levi as a tribal name is merely a genealogical fiction. The association of both Simeon and Levi with Shechem may be taken as evidence of the wide diffusion of the early Levitical traditions. Simeon is best known as a southern tribe: Levi as his "brother" should also be looked for in the same quarter, and when the Kadesh-narratives speak not of Aaron but of Moses, and not of Levites but of Caleb, it is proper to inquire whether the development expresses historical facts and whether any real bond of connexion can be found to link the Levites with the clans of southern origin.

As a matter of fact, when one proceeds to inspect the names of the Levites it is found that they fall into four classes. (*a*) A large number are colourless, their only distinctive mark being the lateness of their type. Others are associated clearly (*b*) with the family of Moses or (*c*) with clans of South Palestine[2]. Finally (*d*), there are some which prove to be without analogy in Hebrew or have the appearance of being dialectical[3]. We can scarcely regard the name

[1] The alternative assumption is that Peleth is to be emended into the Reubenite Pallu (cp. Gen. xlvi. 9); see further Gray, *Numbers*, pp. 190, 194 sq.

[2] The two classes belong together owing to the relation which subsists between *b* and *c*, above, p. 84.

[3] Of Arabian (e.g. Gershom), or, as in the case of Phinehas, of Egyptian origin. But the latter does not necessarily imply that Phinehas lived in Egypt, see below, p. 95, n. 1.

of the Levitical division Mushi as any other than a derivative of Mosheh, nor can we sever Gershom and Eliezer the sons of Moses from the Gershonite Levites or from Eleazar the son of Aaron—it is even possible, though the connexion is less obvious, that the Merarites derived their name from Miriam (מְרָרִי, מִרְיָם). If we bear this in mind, it will appear at least a remarkable coincidence that the names of the *Gershonite* Levites, Shimei, Jahath, Zimmah, and Zerah, should correspond very closely to Shammah (cp. interchange of forms in 1 Sam. xvi. 9, 2 Sam. xiii. 3, xxi. 21), Nahath, Mizzah (מִזָּה, זִמָּה), and Zerah the sons of the Edomite (and Mosaïte) Reuel. Such Levite gentilics as Hebroni and Libni point conclusively to Hebron and Libnah, Mahli probably to Mahalath (Gen. xxviii. 9), and Eder and Shamir as names of Levites are identical with Judaean places (Josh. xv. 21, 48). Jeremoth seems to be an intentional or unintentional derivative from Yarmuth; Shebuel and Shubael suggest comparison with Shobal, a name which is Edomite and Calebite.

Thus it seems clear that we must allow some relationship between the Levites and the clans from the south. These South Palestinian communities, whether regarded as Levitical or secular families, were closely united, and specific traditions associate them with Kadesh and the journey northwards[1]. But it is obvious that such a conclusion cannot be pressed too far. There is always a tendency for tradition to express itself in generalizing terms beyond proper limits. Not every Israelite was a full member of the tribe in which he was enrolled, and although the Israelites believed that they came out of Egypt, few critics would agree that *every* tribe had been there. Hence it would be an unwarranted assumption to claim that all Levites were southerners or the converse; the term could be, and no doubt was, extended to include all members of the caste, and the act of adoption or incorporation would lead all new-comers to claim the same ancestry as the rest. Moreover, it is essential to remember that

[1] The evidence of the proper names, usually accepted as proof of the relationship between Judaean and Edomite clans, is thus extended to the Levites, and such a growth as that of the figure of Korah is regarded as typical. Mosaïtes become Aaronites (cp. 1 Chron. xxiii. 14) even as Moses in the narratives obtains the assistance of Aaron (originally of a Jethro or Hobab). This gradual development of ideas illustrates the relation between the pre-eminence of Caleb and the selection of the Levites, each of which is narrated before the commencement of a journey (see above, pp. 69 sqq., 78, n. 1). But there would probably be no room for Caleb by the side of Levi in any old document, and the event recorded in Exod. xxxii. 26 sqq. implies a relatively later historical period when the term "Levites" prevailed, and their distinctive traditions were recast.

we are dealing, not with plain historical narratives, but with records whose historical kernel is uncertain. What was told of Caleb, Korah, Bezalel, and others may represent a persistent belief even though the details may not be strictly in accordance with the facts. The first endeavour must always be to collect such beliefs. It is necessary, therefore, to determine whether the links which unite Kadesh, the southern clans, and the Levites recur with sufficient consistency to enable us to infer that there was a great body of tradition which pointed to the south of Palestine as opposed to that specifically Israelite tradition which is to be associated with the crossing of the Jordan. It seems probable that the required evidence actually exists.

The old source in Num. xvi includes Dathan and Abiram sons of Eliab ben Reuben. There is no obvious reason why Reuben should be associated with Levites or Calebites, although a careful study of the Reubenite traditions suggests that the tribe was once closely connected with the south of Judah[1]. On the other hand, the mere mention of Reuben seems to carry us away to the route round by the Dead Sea, and since Kadesh, or even a more northerly place, would be an appropriate starting-point for such a journey, there is just the possibility that the story of the dissension may have led to the account of a twofold move, the one to Judah, the other towards Moab[2]. Unfortunately, very little tradition has been preserved which would throw light upon the question, and it is difficult to determine whether the *Reubenite* origin of Dathan and Abiram is original, or how far attempts may not have been made to give effect to the development of traditions which were held by this tribe alone[3].

In Num. xxv P relates a story of the Simeonite Zimri, and here at least it is evident that, irrespective of the details of the incident, Simeon is the tribe which is to be expected in a cycle of traditions dealing with the south. Another story, also by P, deals with the grandson of Dibri the Danite (Lev. xxiv)[4], and the mention of this tribe brings us to the question of the association of Dan with the Kadesh narratives. The fact that Dan appears to be held up for blame in Lev. xxiv proves nothing for the early history: there are too many stories of offences (Moses, Aaron, Miriam) for this to form

[1] It will suffice to refer further to H. W. Hogg's article "Reuben" in *Encyc. Bib.*

[2] See above, pp. 80 and 81, note 1.

[3] e. g. a subsequent move from Judah to Moab.

[4] On a possible connexion between Dibri and Zimri, see *Encyc. Bib.*, col. 1101, note; and on the possibility that P builds upon older tradition, see above, pp. 67, 76, 83.

the foundation for any theory. The first point to be noticed is the tradition of the Danite Aholiab, the partner of Bezalel the Calebite. The strange name Aholiab finds analogies in S. Arabian inscriptions and in Phoenician, and it is to be noted that the famous Phoenician Hiram was, on his mother's side, of Naphtalite (1 Kings vii. 14) or of Danite origin (2 Chron. ii. 14). This variation is slight and intelligible, for both Dan and Naphtali are "sons" of Bilhah and may have been as closely linked in the south (Dan's earlier seats) as they certainly were subsequently in the north [1]. There is also the possibility that the names Hiram and Hur are identical, and it is curious that in the time of Josephus the latter was identified with the husband of Miriam; but this evidence is naturally late, and it is more to the point to notice that tradition knew of an encampment of Kenites near Kadesh in Naphtali (Judges iv. 11). Important, also, is the fact that the Danite priesthood traced its origin to Gershom, a Levite of Bethlehem, and son of Moses, since in the story of the Danites some intercourse between the tribesmen and the Levite is presupposed (above, p. 40). Close relationship is found, also, in the genealogies of 1 Chron. ii where the southern Danite seats are connected with cities in Judah with which Caleb, Kenites, and Bethlehem itself are already associated. Moreover, we can hardly separate the name Manoah from the Judaean Manahath (Josh. xv. 59, LXX) or from the clan of the Manahathites, and under these circumstances it is very probable that the Danite Mahaneh-Dan should be corrected into Manahath-Dan. Hence, when the clan is traced back to Shobal a son of Caleb, it is quite appropriate that the Edomite list in Gen. xxxvi. 23 should include among the "sons" of Shobal a Manahath [2]. Thus, when Dan and Caleb are linked in the narratives of the wilderness and in the genealogies of Judah, when priests of Dan are of Mosaic origin and Kenites encamp under the protection of its brother tribe, and when relations between Dan and Levites are found to be susceptible of explanation, it is very difficult not to ignore the persistency and also the consistency of the traditions [3]. Consequently, the position of Dan in the Kadesh narratives appears to be quite as appropriate as that of Caleb, Korah, and the Levites.

But not only is Dan found in the south and north, the story of the despoiled sanctuary in the highlands of Ephraim, concisely and pithily told in its present form, is an indication that much more

[1] Comp. Bilhan, an Edomite name (Gen. xxxvi. 27); and see H. W. Hogg, *Encyc. Bib.*, art. "Bilhah."

[2] Also Shepho and Onam (cp. p. 58, n. 2).

[3] That the Danite migration was subsequent to David's time appears probable on independent grounds (p. 41).

was known of the circumstance than the composite story in Judges (xvii sq.) relates. The story has been brought into touch with that of Dinah at Shechem—another specimen of the kind of tradition that was current—and the fact that here Levi and Simeon are the leading figures tends to connect Dinah with the traditions of Dan. The stories of the tribal fortunes are thus analogous to those of the national ancestors, and in recognizing that the belief existed that such a tribe as Simeon had relations in the south of Palestine and at Shechem[1], or that Danite traditions knew of the tribe's dealings in three distinct parts of Palestine, we are brought face to face with the same kind of phenomena that recur in the stories of the patriarchs.

The recovery of allied traditions is thus of the utmost value for historical investigation, and it is particularly important to notice that whilst the "Calebite" tradition in the story of the exodus has been almost wiped out and the points of evidence noticed in the course of this section are scattered and fragmentary[2], the "Israelite" view is presented as a finished scheme, superimposed, however, upon its rival. With its description of an invasion of Palestine by Joshua from beyond the Jordan the "Israelite" tradition presents features which can be traced in the stories of Abraham, Jacob, and Saul. The alternative view, on the other hand (whether we call it "Calebite" or "Levitical"), is almost as comprehensive, and associates itself generally with the history of David. David's relation to the southern clans is clear. He is found at Ziklag, on friendly terms with the Philistines (cp. Isaac), and it is to be inferred from Josh. xv. 31, xix. 5 that the place lay far to the south (see further, above, p. 7). In his movement northwards he regularly consults the oracle[3] which is in

[1] It need scarcely be emphasized that we are dealing with traditions without investigating the historical kernel which may underly them; hence, although there is very little evidence to connect the tribe Simeon with central or (like Dan) with northern Palestine, it seems clear that the chronicler's tradition of the Simeonites' home in 2 Chron. xv. 9 and xxxiv. 6 (between Ephraim and Naphtali) cannot be entirely disassociated from the situation in Gen. xxxiv.

[2] See above, p. 82, n. 1.

[3] On the theory outlined above (pp. 38 sq., 42; cp. p. 55, n. 2), this was no other than the ark (see especially 1 Kings ii. 26); "ephod" in 1 Sam. xxiii. 9, xxx. 7 would thus be an intentional alteration to avoid the contradiction with the tradition in 1 Sam. vii. 1, 2. Also in 1 Sam. xiv. 18 the LXX corrects "ark" to "ephod," although it is probable that this narrative, too, was ignorant of the same tradition: it is evident from the text of the latter part of this verse that efforts have been made to alter its original tenor. (On xiv. 3, see p. 22 and note 3.) An interesting analogy is

the care of his priest Abiathar (cp. the names Jether, Jethro). Intimate relations with the clans of the Negeb are reflected. Before Jerusalem could be held, it was necessary to clear the district of an enemy, and with the installation of the ark a fitting climax to the journey was seen (2 Sam. vii. 6, 23)[1]. This represents the *southern* point of view. On the other hand, in the installation of the ark at Shiloh, which is presupposed in the book of Joshua, after the invasion from the *east*, may we recognize a parallel climax? If so, the account of the ark in 1 Sam. v–vii. 1, which appears to have belonged originally to neither, possibly serves the purpose of reconciling the conflicting representations[2].

Everywhere it is necessary to let the narratives speak for themselves and to attempt to understand their standpoint before their relative historical value can be estimated. We can scarcely sever the traditions of David's relations with Israel whilst at the court of Saul from the further development which is preserved by the chronicler. The latter, at all events in his view that men from all the tribes of Israel deserted Saul and came to David at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii), is consistent with the situations represented in the earlier book (cp. 1 Sam. xviii. 5 sqq., 16, 22, 30) and both must be judged together[3]. The historian who naturally starts by collecting all the material bearing upon his subject cannot ignore this later form of tradition, and when he proceeds to pass judgment upon its genuineness will find it difficult to determine precisely where fact ceases and fancy begins. That one detail is preserved in the book of Chronicles and the other in Samuel

found in 1 Sam. xvii. 54, where the writer was so much out of touch with the history of the time that he assumed that Jerusalem was Israelite. A similar loss of perspective in Gen. xxvi. 1 finds Philistines in the time of Isaac. See below, p. 99, n. 1.

[1] Note even the chronicler's representation of tradition (1 Chron. xxiii. 26): "and also the Levites shall have no more need to carry the tabernacle," &c. That there were traditions which ignored the fortunes of the ark in the *Israelite* conquest (cp. 2 Sam. vii. 6 and Kennedy, *ad loc.*) is extremely significant. Even 1 Chron. vii. 27 treats Joshua as indigenous (but note ver. 26).

[2] The objection that if the southern clans had really taken the ark with them it could not have been with David, since Caleb was already in its seat in the Negeb, would only have weight *if* it were true that the same body of traditions could not contain inconsistent views. On the contrary, although the *Israelite* traditions had located the ark at Shiloh, in Judges xx. 27 sq. it is found at Bethel. As a matter of fact the southern cycle seems to have undergone constant development on independent lines, partly through the influence of David's figure.

[3] See above, pp. 3, 6.

is not enough by itself to attest its value: late writings, where they do not chance to preserve old genuine material, *may* naturally represent late stages in the development of traditions quite as reputable as those in earlier works[1]. Indeed, the admittedly close relation between David and the Judaean clans, and the evidence connecting the latter with the Levites suggests that herein lies the germ of the chronicler's account of the institution of the Levitical orders by David. Clothed though it is in a wealth of detail which is often almost worthless[2], it embodies the conviction that the ideal king could not be imagined apart from the sacred sect (cp. both Jer. xxxiii. 17 sq. and Zech. xii. 12 sq.), and it is perhaps pertinent to recall that the scribal families are associated with Calebite and Kenite clans and with Bethlehem the traditional birthplace of David. From what is known of the population of this district the energetic development of Levitical tradition appears to be self-evident.

Perhaps no one can read Num. xiv. 11–24 or Josh. xiv. 6–15 without observing the very great importance of Caleb in traditions of a relatively late age. The promise that his seed should possess the land upon which he had trodden points at least to the diligent preservation of the traditions of the clan, and to the interest which was taken in its fortunes[3]. It is difficult to suppose that these passages stood alone, and it is only when one perceives that there were other clans closely associated with Caleb that it is possible to infer that the eponym Caleb was far from being so restricted as the genealogical information in 1 Chron. ii would suggest. This chapter, as is well known, reflects two conditions of the clan: (*a*) its seat in the south of Judah, and (*b*) a further movement northwards to the district of Bethlehem. That some relationship was felt or feigned with east Jordanic clans seems to follow from the statement that Hezron the "father" of Caleb and Jerahmeel married the daughter of Machir the father of Gilead and thus became the ancestor of Segub and Jair (vers. 21 sq.). In view of familiar genealogical fictions it would be extremely precarious to infer that these eastern clans were physically related to Judaean clans, and the evidence

[1] By earlier works is meant those which were completed at an earlier date. Under the circumstances the latest portions of these may well be almost contemporary with the earlier portions of those writings which were not completed until a much later date.

[2] The evidence of the proper names, however, is instructive (see G. B. Gray, *Hebrew Proper Names*).

[3] Note, also, the pious wish for the extension of the borders of Jabez, a mysterious name but with Calebite or Kenite affinities (1 Chron. ii. 55, iv. 9 sq.).

can only have as much *historical* value as the varied genealogical details of the tribes of Israel. But there appears to be no intelligible reason why the chronicler should have invented his statement, and since his representation of Caleb's movements is admitted to rest upon sound tradition it is necessary to consider whether the notice is entirely isolated or not.

The notion that certain "sons of Hezron," clans of nomadic origin[1], proceeded upwards to Judah and that others of the same stock pursued their way to the east of the Jordan is not an unnatural one. Already[2] in the story of the wanderings there was reason to suppose that tradition (at some undefined stage) knew of a march across the northern end of Edom, which ended with the achievements of the clans Machir and Jair (Num. xxxii. 39 sqq.). On the assumption that P's narratives may be based upon earlier sources it should be noticed that the clans of Manasseh come to the fore and that the fortunes of Reuben and Gad are equally prominent. This evidence by itself, however suggestive, is as inconclusive as the position of Reuben in the story of Korah's revolt, to which a precise reference is made in the story of the daughters of Zelophehad (xxvii. 3). But the same thread runs through this series, and the presence of the *old* notice of Machir and Jair is significant in such a context.

Further, the patriarch Isaac is found sojourning among the Philistines of Gerar (Gen. xxvi) in a district which another writer places between Kadesh and Shur (chap. xx). Stories are told of his strife with the natives and of his covenant at Beersheba, and here are located the incidents which lead to the separation of Esau and Jacob. Since one version placed the theophany at Bethel on Jacob's *return* from Shechem[3], it is to be inferred that it knew of a direct journey from Beersheba to Haran (see Gen. xxviii. 10). Now the return represents a great national tradition which can be traced in the stories of Abraham and Joshua, conceivably also, of Saul[4]. This being so, the question arises whether Jacob's journey northwards to his relatives may not represent a rival tradition of quite distinct origin. It would not suffice to regard the step as a necessary prelude

[1] The name Hezron suggests nomadic encampments.

[2] Above, p. 80 sq. ; see also p. 87.

[3] Above, p. 57 sq.

[4] Cp. above, p. 59 sq. Here the separation of Esau and Jacob is preserved in a context after the departure from Bethel (Gen. xxxvi. 6 sqq.), according to the other tradition the separation precedes the journey, and P at this stage preserves a brief notice of Esau's marriages (xxviii. 9). (The interpretation of the meeting in Gen. xxxii, however, remains obscure. The passage may not be in its true place.)

to the events in Gen. xxix sqq., since it would be equally reasonable to hold that the entire account of the rivalry between Jacob and Esau was intended to explain the patriarch's appearance in the Aramaean district. It seems preferable to connect the details with the suggested evidence for the existence of two great conflicting traditions, and one ventures to conclude that there was a stage in the southern tradition when relationship was claimed by the Judaean clans with those east of the Jordan.

The existence of some union of this kind would appear to throw light upon certain details in the traditions of David. Evidently some friendliness between Moab and David was intelligible to the writer of 1 Sam. xxii. 3 sq., although no very clear explanation has been suggested. Later tradition in the genealogy appended to the book of Ruth affords no help, since "the fact that a young woman had married into the tribe of Judah, renouncing her own gods and leaving her father's house, would constitute a precarious title for her great-grandson in claiming protection" (H. P. Smith). Since it can scarcely be supposed that a couple of verses in 1 Sam. xxii gave birth to the later genealogy, it is reasonable to assume that both notices have drawn upon a common tradition which was evidently not a scanty one. Again, although it has appeared natural to regard David's priest Ira the *Jairite* (2 Sam. xx. 26) as originally a man of Jattir in Judah[1], recent commentators accept the text, although they do not seem to explain the presence of this Gileadite. If Ira should be restored also in viii. 18 with Klostermann and Budde, the choice of a man from Ishbaal's kingdom (ii. 8) at this early period (on the traditional view) becomes more singular. And if the restoration is to be accepted on textual grounds it is thus necessary to notice the remarkable combination—David's sons and a Jairite! Yet again, reference was made in the first section to David's flight to Mahanaim after the revolt of Absalom (2 Sam. xvii. 24, see p. 16); it was here that Ishbaal had set up his throne, and one hardly understands how David could have hoped for assistance, especially if, according to the ordinary view, all Israel (including Saul's followers) followed Absalom. But if the account of Ishbaal's sovereignty is from an entirely distinct tradition, this difficulty is removed, and the kindness of Machir and Barzillai the Gileadite finds a plausible explanation. On these grounds it may be argued that the chronicler's tradition of the common origin of Machir and Jair, Caleb and Jerahmeel is no isolated detail, still less is it the invention of his age[2].

[1] Reading הַיִּתְרִי for הָעִירִי with the Peshitta and Lucian.

[2] It is naturally doubtful whether this tradition would explain the two Geshurs (Joshua xiii. 2, 11), or the recurrence of the apparent clan-name

It is obviously precarious to base theories upon tribal traditions alone, and the free application of the genealogical or ethnological key without the support of other considerations is unsafe. Unprejudiced investigation when conducted comprehensively can draw no distinction between so-called patriarchal records and those which are usually regarded as historical. Traditions—"That which has been handed down"—manifest themselves in genealogies, sagas, and in the stories of heroes, and these classes of evidence require to be studied with equal care for the light that they may be expected to throw upon each other. The growth of national tradition is marked by many stages in which conflicting views are compromised or reconciled, and granted that alien clans were absorbed, there would naturally result in course of time a mingling of traditions. It is hardly to be expected that any one scheme would at once leap into popular favour, and divergent forms could still appear even after a compromise had been effected.

The theory that there were two main bodies of tradition, one of which pointed to a movement from the south upwards to the north and north-east, whilst the other referred it from the east westwards, is undoubtedly open to criticism on account of the scattered evidence upon which the former is based, but it may be maintained that it covers a number of details which fit only loosely into the latter. That S[1] has been rigorously treated can be explained naturally by the desire to give the prominence to C. That historical difficulties

Maacah in the south and east (Gen. xxii. 24, 1 Chron. vii. 16). Other points of uncertain value which may be noticed are (*a*) the isolated passage Num. xxi. 16–18*a*, which brings the people as far as Beer (? Beersheba, cp. Gen. xxviii. 10 and *Encyc. Bib.*, col. 2651, n. 4); thenceforth the narratives deal entirely with the journey east of the Dead Sea: was Beersheba the scene of a parting of the clans? (*b*) The possibility that Jacob's visit to his relatives was to a nearer place than Ḥarran has been frequently upheld (e. g. by C. T. Beke, *Origines Biblicae*, 1834, i. 131); for the view that the names Zilpah and Zelophehad were identical, see C. Niebuhr, *Gesch.*, I, 253, and for Cheyne's suggestion that these, as also Milcah the wife of Nahor, should be corrected to Salecah (Ṣalḥad), see *Encyc. Bib.*, sub voc. These views would tend to bring the story of Jacob's visit into closer touch with the narratives in Numbers. It may be added that the evidence above in the text does not favour the view that the conquest of Gilead was made by tribes from the west of the Jordan; contrast 1 Chron. vii. 14 sq.

[1] For the sake of convenience use may be made of the symbols C (i. e. the invasion of Central Palestine by the Israelites from the east, the prevailing tradition) and S (i. e. south, the tradition of the movement from the south northwards into Judah).

may be found cannot be gainsaid, but in view of the difficulty of interpreting the tribal traditions of Israel which has been felt by all who have approached the study, a new theory is not excluded. C itself, when it implies the existence of Judah and Benjamin as distinct entities, the survival of Simeon and Reuben, and the secular position of Levi, presupposes conditions which are so complicated that there is considerable conflict of opinion regarding the interpretation of its main outlines: owing to the character of the evidence it will perhaps never be possible to remove all the difficulties which confront one.

The view of Wellhausen and others that the original tribes were seven, six of which were sons of Leah, and one (Joseph) the son of Rachel, seems to confirm the early pre-eminence of S, but of Joseph the original Kadesh stories contain no trace. Nor is the connexion of these narratives with Egypt at all conclusively established until that stage is reached where Sinai-Horeb comes to the fore. Naturally, the historicity of the exodus from Egypt is not endangered thereby, one has only to observe the brief treatment of other similar journeys (e. g. Abraham, Jacob, Ezra)[1]. Again, the fluctuation of tradition of the course taken between Kadesh and the arrival at the Jordan can scarcely be ignored (see above, p. 80), and although the view which P holds appears to rest upon an old foundation, on historical grounds the tradition of a journey from the gulf of 'Akabah northwards can with difficulty be applied to any of the Israelite tribes. But it must be admitted that such a movement, along the trade-route which led up to Moab, is in itself perfectly natural. A more consecutive tradition appears in the account of the conquest under Joshua, although again there are earlier and later views, and considerable obscurity is attached to the question of the occupation of central Palestine (see above, p. 57).

[1] In the growth of tradition, the story of the individual Joseph seems important, but the traditions of the Josephite tribes are scanty (see above, p. 57, note 2). Apart from the controversial question of the extension of the term Miṣraim and the twofold Goshen, it is not unreasonable to suppose that traces of Egyptian influence continued to prevail in South Palestine even in the days of the monarchy. Spiegelberg's explanation of the name Phicol (Abimelech's captain, Gen. xxi. 22, xxvi. 26) as "man of Kharu (Syria and Palestine)" is particularly interesting in view of the parallel name Phinehas (*Orientalist. Lit. Zeitung*, Feb. 1906), and the suggestion that Ḫur-waṣi, on the cuneiform tablet of B. C. 651 found at Gezer, was an Egyptian (*PEF. Quart. Stat.*, 1904, pp. 239, 243) would (if sound) be evidence of the persistence of conditions which could affect the traditions of the south.

It is safer to recognize the presence of conflicting traditions than to attempt to reconcile them, and if the reality of S can be maintained, it is certainly difficult to find the factor which led to the victory of C. That there was considerable fusion and compromise is to be expected[1], and this can probably be discovered in the traditions of Saul and David. Saul is naturally associated with central Palestine, he enters into a covenant with Gibeon, and both Gibeon and Beeroth have cause to avenge themselves upon his descendants. The hostility of a people to the south is reflected also in the stories of Joshua's wars. But the evidence suggests that this population (roughly comprised in the later terms Judah and Benjamin) was closely related to the south of Palestine[2], and was intimately connected with those clans whose traditions appear in S. If the conjecture could be made that the extension southwards (of Joseph tribes) was after that which had already begun to extend northwards, it would result that the former was superimposed upon the latter, which is precisely the fate of S when it was taken over into C[3]. Before the union of central Palestine and the south, traditions from the standpoint of the one would regard the other as hostile. But when a union was effected, compromises were made. These would everywhere take various forms, since in the merging and development of traditions many minor factors must have influenced their course. In the final scheme, as set forth in Judges i, all the tribes—including Judah and Simeon—are sons of Israel and have one common starting-point for their expeditions to occupy the promised land, and it is possible that a recollection of the hostility which subsisted between central Palestine and the south is expressed by the view, also conveyed in the same chapter, that the unfriendly neighbour of each consisted of an intervening strip of land which was held by the earlier non-Israelite inhabitants[4].

[1] See on Joshua, above, p. 82.

[2] See above, p. 58 and note 2.

[3] With this compare the view of Guthe that Israel proper reached Palestine from the east *later* than Reuben, Simeon, Levi, and Judah (*Encyc. Bib.*, col. 2225), or of H. W. Hogg, that Benjamin occupied districts which had been associated with Simeon, Reuben, Dan (col. 535), Dan being "not impossibly" *older* than Joseph, or an "unsuccessful precursor of Benjamin." (It will be noticed that the birth of Benjamin follows after the dispersion of Simeon and Levi in Gen. xxxiv.) Such views based mainly upon the tribal traditions do not appear to take sufficient account of the possibility that historical events of later date (J and E are placed in the 9th–8th century at the earliest) may have helped their growth. See below, Sect. IX.

[4] On the evidence for the belt, see p. 42 sq.

These conditions are evidently ignored: (*a*) when Saul's sovereignty extends over Judah (1 Sam. xv, xxiii. 6 sqq., xxvii. 10, 12[1]); (*b*) when David has his home in Bethlehem and has friendly relations with Israel and the court of Saul, and (*c*) when the latter is in Benjamin. It will be noticed that 1 Sam. xv. 2 points to Exod. xvii. 16 and Deut. xxv. 17–19, and represents a relatively late stage in the traditions of the Exodus[2], and even 1 Sam. xxx. 26 (Amalek the enemy of Yahweh), although one of the oldest sources of David's life, refers to former Amalekite hostility in a way that seems to ignore the *successful* movement northwards (Num. xxi. 1–3)[3]. Two distinct standpoints are found, also, when, on the one hand, the annalist records that Saul's kingdom was set up at Mahanaim (2 Sam. ii. 8–10), and, on the other, when Mahanaim becomes the place where David found a refuge; and equally important differences show themselves in the contiguous, though now contradictory chronological notices in 2 Sam. ii. 10 and 11[4]. Under these circumstances the traditions of the relations of David to Saul's house appeared to require more critical handling[5].

Among the narratives which go to build up the story of Saul's rise we find a similarity of topics in Judges xiii sqq. when compared with 1 Sam. i sqq. In Judges we meet with the Danite Samson the Nazirite, the Danite migration (cp. names in xviii. 2, 12 with xiii. 25), the Bethlehem Levite the grandson of Moses, the unnamed sanctuary of Ephraim, the Ephraimite Levite allied by marriage with Bethlehem. The relation of these to S has already been noticed. On turning to 1 Sam. we find the Nazirite Samuel son of Elkanah ben Jeroham the Zuphite, the ark at Shiloh the Ephraimite sanctuary, Eli and the priests of Mosaïte (or Aaronite) origin, further, the places Beth-shemesh and Kirjath-jearim (cp. Judges xviii. 12), and the significant personal names Phinehas, Abiathar (cp. Jether–Jethro), Joshua, Abinadab (cp. Nadab, Exod. xxiv. 1, and above, p. 77 and note 1), and Eleazar. The general tone is illustrated also by the references to the deliverance of Israel from Egypt in 1 Sam. iv. 8, vi. 6. It agrees with the development of tradition, noticeable in Exodus and Numbers, that these are partly reminiscent of Kadesh traditions; they also ignore the non-Israelite district (contrast, however, Judg. xix. 10–12). The prominence of Shiloh associates itself with the history of Israel in the book of Joshua, and it is interesting that the narratives regarding the old family of priests probably preserve in the name Ichabod a tradition of the family of Moses[6]. Two points of view may be

[1] Above, p. 7. [2] Above, p. 79, n. 1.
[3] See p. 81 sq. [4] Cp. above, p. 11. [5] Above, pp. 3, 17 sq.
[6] For Ichabod as an intentional alteration of Jochebed, see *Encyc. Bib.*, col. 2144 (cp. also Wellhausen, *Comp. Hex.*, 1899, p. 371).

observed. On the one hand, Joshua of Timnath-heres ("T. of the sun"), the hero of C's conquest of Palestine from the east, finds a place at Beth-Shemesh ("house of the sun") in the neighbourhood of Danite and allied clans in much the same way that a place had to be found for him in another part of S[1]. On the other hand, C has apparently derived from S the tradition of its Mosaïte clans, and Shiloh must needs claim relationship with the family of Moses. Moreover, Samuel, although indisputably Ephraimite, as the narratives stand, is a descendant of Jerahmeel (so LXX for Jeroham in 1 Sam. i. 1), and it can hardly be supposed that this name has here lost its original ethnical force[2]. This, if correct, is of no little interest for the traditions of his relations with David, and suggests a semi-historical foundation for the later theory that he was a Levite[3].

In the course of the growth of hierarchical institutions, Moses is replaced by Aaron, and the changes that influenced the narratives of the Exodus find their counterpart in the disgrace and disappearance of both Dan and Shiloh. The Mosaïtes of Dan pass out of

[1] Viz. Exod. xvii. 8 sqq. which ignores the defeat in Num. xiv. 43–45 (leading to the circuitous journey into Palestine), but develops the victory in Num xxi. 1–3 (see above, p. 82, n. 2). Contrast with this compromise the independent standpoint in 1 Chron. vii. 27 (p. 90, n. 1).

[2] The alternative view that the genealogy is conflate, and that Eli was of southern origin would strengthen the above views, and Jastrow's suggestion that Shĕmû'ĕl is only a modification of Shĕbû'ĕl, and therefore of Shobal (cp. above, p. 86) should be noticed; see *Encyc. Bib.*, col. 4496.

[3] The southern origin of Samuel has been suspected previously on other grounds (see p. 52). In regard to the chronicler's theory in 1 Chron. vi, it is clear that (*a*) the connexion of the Levites as a whole with the south can be independently maintained; and that (*b*) there was obviously a period when the Levites were not known under that specific name. Accordingly, there may have been a tendency to "Levitize" prominent men of southern origin, e. g. Obed-edom, Heman, or Ethan. Joshua, it will be noticed, is left untouched—not unnaturally, since he did not belong to the southern cycle of tradition. It may be added that the Jerahmeelite names Nathan and Zabad may be identified with David's prophet and the officer otherwise known as Zabud (so, as regards the latter, Bishop Hervey). It is possible, therefore, that Nathan and Samuel belonged to the same clan in old tradition. The name of Gad, another of David's seers, suggests an association with the "son" of Leah's maid Zilpah (for the conjecture that this name should be connected with Zelophehad, see above, p. 93, n. 2 end), but it seems too much to suppose that the relationship with east Jordan clans (above, p. 91 sqq.) should be introduced in this manner, and we may treat it as a coincidence—although a curious one.

existence, and those of Shiloh are threatened with the supremacy of a new line of priests: the Zadokites. In the story of Eli, 1 Sam. ii. 27–36 betrays an acquaintance with subsequent events and directly alludes to the steps which other writers attribute to Josiah. Changes of ritual, already duly reflected in the traditions around Kadesh and Sinai, find their representation in the early history of the monarchy, and when the figure of Zadok is introduced into the history of David by the side of Abiathar whom he ultimately supersedes, we may probably recognize the desire to co-ordinate the building of the temple by Solomon with the institution of the Zadokite priests at Jerusalem [1]. Similarly the institution of the calf-worship is associated with Jeroboam.

In conclusion, the studies which have been undertaken in the present series of notes have led to the theory that two main views prevailed in ancient Israel regarding its origin. The belief that it had entered from beyond the Jordan and spread over the land of Palestine, whether in the course of a gradual movement (Judges i), or as the result of great conquests (book of Joshua), has superseded, it appears, another one wherein it was held that the movement came from the south. Doubtless the apparent earlier view of Israel's origin was unjustifiably claimed by clans or tribes to the same extent that the subsequent popular one expresses conditions which, as critics agree, are not altogether reliable. Neither of the two schemes is free from serious historical difficulties; a fact which is generally admitted as regards the latter, and must be confessed in respect to the former. How fundamentally the distinct southern tradition or rather body of traditions affects the narratives relating to the history of the eleventh century B.C. is obvious [2]. But the

[1] When a prophet of Shiloh appears in the time of Jeroboam (1 Kings xi. 29 sqq.) it is not likely that the writer forgot the disasters which are implied after 1 Sam. vii. 2, since the fall of Shiloh was a recent event in Jeremiah's day. The true *sequence* is observed when the priests are subsequently found at Nob (1 Sam. xxi. sq.—if Nob lay north of Jerusalem, cp. Anathoth, 1 Kings ii. 26, also the home of Jeremiah), and the case finds an analogy in the relative position of Exod. xvi sqq. (presupposing a law-giving) after ibid. xv. 25; see above, p. 70.

[2] This is not in itself a fatal objection, for it is precisely the details which are at variance with the prevailing traditions (upon which our conceptions of Hebrew history are largely based) that require close attention. Even in so vital a matter as the origin of Yahweh-worship it cannot be overlooked that one representation carried it back to the earliest times (Gen. iv. 26), and the evidence, however isolated, must have had some meaning in the age when it was first written down. If

theory does not spring from *a priori* assumptions based upon the remarkable amount of material at this period as contrasted with later history (see above, p. 31 sq., and especially p. 60 sq.). If some reliance has been placed upon narratives whose lateness (it may be objected) renders their contents suspicious, it is necessary to point to the persistence of tradition and to the agreement in the situations which made it impossible to reject or accept arbitrarily individual details merely on account of the source in which they were contained or the date to which each is ascribed by modern criticism. Literary analysis is the indispensable prelude to historical criticism, but the dates that result must be checked by the criticism of the historical records (cp. above, p. 46).

this cycle of southern traditions can be substantiated, it is evident from a number of points that it underwent a lengthy historical development. But the chronological limits can scarcely be examined without taking into account the entire history of Judah, and it is very clear from the genealogical relations between the southern clans and Edom (the presumed dates of the Edomite genealogical notices are particularly important) that the history of Edom is a valuable factor in the inquiry.

[1] À propos of this it may seem remarkable that the Calebite genealogies in 1 Chron. ii cover something like half a millenium. It is agreed that the earlier portions of the Calebite genealogy reflect conditions which are found in the narratives of David's life; it is agreed, also, that the later portions represent the situation in the exile when the clan held seats further to the north. Accordingly, it appears that it did not move up when David captured Jerusalem and cleared the intervening district of its hostile inhabitants; it was not affected by the migrations of allied clans (Danites, Kenites), and notwithstanding the serious disasters which shook the kingdom of Judah, it succeeded in maintaining itself for many centuries merely moving a trifling distance northwards in this lengthy period! It is only when one considers what this means that the current view of 1 Chron. ii is "not an easy one" (p. 40, n. 1). The precise relation of these clans to Judah is extremely perplexing because they do not appear to have coalesced with Judah until a very late date (cp. Meyer, *Israeliten u. ihre Nachbarstämme*, pp. 407–9). But what was Judah without their numbers? Here, as also in the Edomite evidence, and in the traditions of the tribes, the chronological relation of the sources and the relation of the conditions they represent to the historical scheme make the problems the more intricate.

VII. Literary and Historical Criticism.

Before bringing to a close the present series of notes on the early history of Israel, it is necessary to refer briefly to some methods and results of criticism which will be found to bear upon the sections which follow. The study of Old Testament history is peculiarly difficult, partly because it is a religious history and closely bound up with religious convictions, but more especially because the complexity and scantiness of the written material preclude finality. Although there is unanimity among O. T. scholars regarding the essential results of literary criticism, there is a marked absence of uniformity in the individual standpoints and in the handling of historical problems. Thanks to unintermittent labours in the past decades, it is possible to trace some development of Israel's religion and institutions, but to the corresponding growth of her traditions comparatively little attention is paid. This is particularly true of the earlier periods, and it is not an exaggeration to assert that no single reconstruction either adequately accounts for all the evidence or is free from problems which future workers will find as grave as some of those which literary criticism has already solved. This is due not merely to the difficulty attending the interpretation of the evidence, but also to the tendency to distribute criticism unequally and inconsistently. That exact criticism which has been directed towards details of law and cult is less prominent when historical problems are at stake, and there is apt to be a tendency to obscure evidence in a manner which—where the Hexateuch is in question—would be recognized as unmethodical. "The work of historical criticism," as Prof. Briggs has said, "has only begun its career[1]."

There are four distinct lines of investigation upon which the problem of the early history of Israel could be attacked. (1) From the Amarna tablets, and other external evidence, it would be possible to obtain a number of "tangible facts," with the help of which it

[1] *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture* (Edinburgh, 1899), p. 531. In the past stages of criticism it has been observed that at every fresh advance and at every new concession, where certain old positions were resigned, there has been a tendency to cling ever more tenaciously to other positions.

would be easy to make a judicious selection of O. T. data which could be made to agree. This method, which may be called the purely "archaeological," consists in bringing together evidence which was not meant to be compared, and is conspicuous for its free (though tacit) rejection of the bulk of traditional material which is opposed to the archaeological results. So uncritical and haphazard a method may be left to itself[1]. Or again (2), there is the literary-critical method, which relies upon stories of the patriarchs, tribal relations, national genealogies, &c., material which is at all events considerably later than the period to which it refers. Naturally, the data are not implicitly accepted, but, by the help of historical theories, they are carefully sifted, and the results are applied to early Israelite history as a whole. They depend upon working hypotheses which may be faulty, they suffer from the lack of early information, and are always liable to confuse the original meaning of the records and their real intention. This, the prevailing method, runs the risk of not being sufficiently historical[2]. A third method (3) would be that which has been profitably undertaken in other departments of O. T. research. The attempt could be made to determine the indispensable features of tribal life and custom, the usual results of invasion, the extent to which invaders are absorbed (or the reverse), and leave their marks upon a land (nomenclature, &c.). It would endeavour to ascertain the leading tendencies of Palestinian life and thought, and it would take into account the characteristics of early historians in other fields. In a word, it would direct its attention to those details which can be studied more thoroughly *outside* the O. T. in the hope of acquiring an amount of experience (not to mention a body of reliable evidence), by means of which the history of Israel could be more luminously reviewed, and its vital characteristics more safely determined. That this, the comparative method, is ultimately indispensable for O. T. research, will

[1] It is interesting to notice that the Egyptian evidence for the early occurrence of Israelite names (e. g. Asher) has led to the paradoxical conclusion that there were Israelites in Palestine before the Exodus, i. e. that some of the sons of Jacob had remained behind when the rest went into Egypt, or that some escaped from Egypt before the main body. Generally speaking, it is singular that the semi-archaeological theories propounded by Orr (*Problems of the O. T.*, pp. 422 sqq.), Petrie (*Researches in Sinai*, chap. xiv), and many others, are often regarded as confirmatory of the O. T., in spite of the upheaval of tradition which is involved.

[2] Apart from the fact that the ethnological interpretation can be easily pushed to excess. Cp. Ed. Meyer's remarks, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, pp. 50, 251 sqq., 422, note 1, 444 sq. ; also Cheyne, *Encyc. Bib.*, col. 5211 (§ 14).

scarcely be denied. But, finally (4), it is at once obvious that it would be unmethodical to *force* the O. T. into agreement with conclusions drawn from any external source. Any *a priori* assumption that that which actually happened is that which the early writers intended to represent would be premature. One must, therefore, apply literary *and* historical criticism, and apply it consistently; one must seek to distinguish between earlier and later phases of thought and tradition, and must treat the evidence in a natural manner, not in the immediate expectation of determining its precise historicity, but rather in the hope of ascertaining what the various writers *believed* to be the history of their past.

Any attempt to study the evidence of the O. T. anew must naturally lay aside preconceived theories, and must be prepared to follow the evidence and not to direct it. It is indispensable that the literary phenomena should be observed, since it is certain that whatever future research or discovery may bring *these* cannot alter. Nothing can remove the present complexity of the O. T. (not even cuneiform originals!), although it is obvious that particular interpretations may be found to need modification or the hypotheses which have been framed upon the latter may prove erroneous. Consequently, one must refrain from fettering oneself with those literary theories which are admittedly provisional and hypothetical, or which rest upon historical grounds the sources for which history have not been independently or adequately tested.

Now, we have to deal with the records of a layer of population which spread itself over an already inhabited land. It is known that when a people is well seated in a region, fixed to the soil by agriculture, and thoroughly acclimatized, it offers an enormous resistance to absorption, whereas the conquerors—or even peaceful immigrants—are apt to be psychically conquered by those whom they have overcome. Israel entered Palestine and lived its history, but the land itself and the people of the soil still retain traces of "primitive Semitic" cult and customs, in spite of the many changes that have swept over the land. Hence, it cannot be ignored that already in the fifteenth century B. C. Palestine was occupied by a *settled* race, whose language, thought, and other features, do not differ vitally from those of the people we meet with in the O. T. There are, naturally, profound differences, but a comprehensive survey of the O. T. in the light of the external evidence proves that a great deal of that which we regard as "Israelite" could and did exist outside the area or the period of Israelite influence[1]. Moreover,

[1] The interesting phraseology of the Amarna Letters, the Taanach tablets, the Phoenician sacrificial institutions, and a wealth of other

we cannot obscure the fact that the writings of the O. T. will represent as specifically Israelite, features of cult, custom, and tradition, which were not the peculiar possession of the invaders, but were the result of absorption and fusion which commonly result when tribes merge. This is quite intelligible when we observe what has happened in other fields under similar circumstances, and although we can fully appreciate the Israelite standpoint of the records, it is manifestly necessary to recognize and make allowance for it. Accordingly, for the early history of Israel, we have to rely upon the traditions which the Israelites themselves have transmitted, we have to study the history of an ancient land, a land which has suffered relatively little from the turmoil of other invasions, from the standpoint of the invaders. This will at once show that historical criticism cannot inevitably adopt *their* attitude and disregard other standpoints [1].

The ordinary methods of historical research, indispensable when one is fortunate enough to possess an abundance of documents, cannot be rigidly applied in O. T. criticism. The scantiness of the evidence, its literary features, and the familiar characteristics of

evidence may seem to show the danger of attempting to sketch "Israelite" religion solely on the basis of Israelite literature.

[1] Similarly, in estimating the exilic and post-exilic periods there is an inclination to adopt the standpoint of the exiles and of those who returned to Palestine without reflecting upon the character of the evidence. The three books, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, were once a single work, although of composite origin. The compiler carries the history of Judah down to the destruction of Jerusalem, passes over the seventy years of desolation, and at once proceeds to the history of the Return. His sympathies are with those who returned, not with the remnant that had been left, although it is certain that it was not a negligible quantity as regards religion or culture. Besides, not only had Palestine *not* been denuded, but exiles had been deported to other places apart from Babylonia. However, for his purpose, the compiler ignores this; he rejects the material which deals with the years immediately after the fall of Jerusalem, and omits to mention the favour shown to Jehoiachin. This is quite intelligible when we understand *his* standpoint, but one will be led to inquire whether this later theory (which he follows) has had an influence upon the literature elsewhere. One may perhaps suspect that the abrupt ending of 2 Kings (cp. also Jeremiah) is due to the excision of material which would have clashed with the compiler's new history, and it is probable that it has left its mark upon the prophecies ascribed to Jeremiah, notably in the tendency to emphasize the fate of the *remnant* of Judah (Jer. xlii-xliv; cp. the variations in LXX, also Schmidt, *Encyc. Bib.*, col. 2379).

early writers unite to emphasize the futility of treating the records by "rules" of research. There are so many factors to be taken into account, so many possibilities for which allowance must be made, that too much caution cannot be exercised. There is the "caution" which impels the historian in other fields to accept only those data which can be placed beyond dispute; there is the "caution" in O. T. study which may be synonymous with conservatism or may imply an ability to reconcile reason with tradition. It is to be presumed that the most scientific "caution" will allow for the circumstances under which the records have been written, and will be attentive to the "methods" which the early writers themselves employed[1].

The great disadvantage under which O. T. research labours, through paucity of material, is at once felt when the presence of legend or myth may be suspected. It is well known that legendary and mythological elements encircle historical figures with a rapidity which is sometimes almost inconceivable. It is known, too, that such elements will readily transfer themselves from one figure to another, and that even whole cycles will be borrowed and adjusted to an environment with which they have no material connexion[2]. It cannot be denied that this process is to be found in the Semitic field, but historical research obviously cannot start by attempting to separate fact from fancy; it will be safer to allow for the possibility that in some cases history has been clothed (perhaps unconsciously) in an unhistorical dress. To be impartial, however, we cannot start with the assumption that unreliable accretion has *not* been attached to figures apparently historical, or that *no* historical elements underlie those where legend and myth can be recognized. The O. T. has preserved traditions—the term does not necessarily mean untrustworthy or unhistorical literature—all of which were doubtless equally reputable in their age. Modern research compels us to reject Gen. i-xi, and we treat it not as scientific and historical information, but as a human record to be read in the light of the age in which it was written. Many critics reject the patriarchal

[1] Thus, incidentally, it is not enough to recognize the compilatory character of the sources, it is quite as important to observe the methods of compilers where composite works can be compared with the original sources. Greater attention to the actual working of compilation would prevent that rigidity of literary and historical criticism which is occasionally noticeable.

[2] Bernheim, *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode* (1902), pp. 323 sq., 461 sqq. For a recent study of such transference, see Gaster, "Legend of Merlin," in *Folk-lore*, XVI, 1905, pp. 409 sqq.

narratives, and again we realize that the sources are the product of subjectivity; they represent familiar beliefs which to the people of the age were as truly historical as other records, which we regard as history, are to us. Other critics commence the history of Israel at other periods, although it is obvious that to understand our evidence we must place ourselves in the position of the writers and ascertain *their* views. We must be sufficiently appreciative and sympathetic to assimilate the writers' attitudes, and sufficiently modern and critical to estimate them at their true value. Thus, we must avoid any initial distinction between narratives apparently historical and those apparently less reputable. To be consistent, it is difficult to see why the traditions of great kings should not have been influenced to the same degree as the ancestral figures; or why the floating elements of legend and myth should not have attached themselves with equal readiness to either. We cannot assume that the "historical" writings were not subjected to the same influences (whether external or internal) as those less historical, nor can we draw any arbitrary distinction between the literary and historical criticism of the Hexateuch and the criticism of those books which were styled (not without good reason) the "Former Prophets." A hasty survey of some of the "methods" of the early writers and of literary criticism alike may be found suggestive.

Where the same motives or traditional elements appear in distinct figures, it may be unnecessary to determine priority, but it invariably happens that duplication of incidents is attended by features of considerable importance for literary or historical criticism. How perplexing the data may be is evident when we notice the separation of Lot (cp. the Edomite name Lotan), Hagar-Ishmael, and Esau-Edom from Abram, Isaac, and Jacob respectively: the significance naturally lies in the close connexion between the members of each triad. It may not be easy to interpret this, but we can infer at all events that these details do not prove successive stages in the ethnological history of Palestine[1]. Another kind of duplication appears in the comparison of Saul's wars (1 Sam. xiv. 47 sqq.) with David's conquests (2 Sam. viii). If we accept the familiar view that the former has

[1] In the stories of Abraham and of Isaac at the court of Abimelech it is instructive to notice the ingenuity shown in bringing the two into connexion (Gen. xxvi. 1, 15, 18); a comparison suggests that the story of Abraham (xx, xxi. 22-34) was originally consecutive. To assume that doublets point to two sources is unnecessary unless a double thread can be traced; a compiler will often introduce another version or a variant, although his work is now a unit (cp. Brockelmann's study on Ibn-el-Aṭîr's *Kâmil* in its relation to Ṭabari, Strassburg, 1890; especially pp. 17 sq.).

been based upon the latter, it is necessary to observe that the writer's friendly interest differs markedly from the tendency of other narratives; if it is due to a redactor, one must ascertain its relation to the account of Saul's rejection, the insertion of which is also ascribed to a redactor; if it is unhistorical, the earlier and fuller account which it is supposed to replace must be equally untrustworthy. At all events, if once its value is doubted, upon what grounds is the value of the panegyric (2 Sam. i) to be upheld? But let us note, in any circumstance, that the excerpt is ascribed to modelling and not to invention.

If older prophecies were adapted to new occasions[1], it is equally likely that historical material was used with similar freedom. It is extremely probable that the account of the journey from the Red Sea to Sinai consists of narratives which belong properly to a later context. They have been transferred with a certain amount of redaction to bring them into harmony with the new setting[2]. There has been manipulation and revision, but not originality or invention, and *because* these simple methods have been employed, and *because* sufficient indications remain to prove their present unsuitability, criticism was able to perceive the anomaly. Also, the stories of Elisha "in which the prophet appears as on friendly terms with the king, and possessed of influence at court, plainly belong to the time of Jehu's dynasty, though they are now related before the fall of the house of Omri[3]." It is agreed, further, that the writer in Ezra iv, who proposed to give an account of the opposition to the Jews, used a passage which is hopelessly at variance with chronology; vers. 6–23 are admittedly borrowed from another context. Finally, it is extremely probable that the Reading of the Law by Ezra on the *seventh* month (Neh. viii), so far from having been delayed a score of years after his return, originally preceded the reforms of the *ninth* month (Ezra ix)[4]. From the preceding examples we may perceive that the employment of such methods does not

[1] e. g. Isa. xv sq.; prophecies on the Scythians (Zephaniah, Jeremiah), Zech. ix–xiv, &c.

[2] See above, pp. 64 sqq. Compare also Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, pp. 342 sqq.; Kent, *Beginnings of Hebrew History*, p. 176; Moore, *Ency. Bibl.*, col. 1443.

[3] So W. R. Smith (see Kautzsch, *Ency. Bibl.*, col. 2670), Kuenen, Skinner (*Century Bible*: *Kings*, p. 290); cp. also Benzinger, p. 130; Addis, *Encyc. Bib.*, "Elisha," §§ 2, 5. The conclusion has an important bearing upon the criticism of that period.

[4] Torrey, *Ezra-Nehemiah*, p. 31; Kent, *Israel's Hist. and Biog. Narratives*, pp. 32, 369. G. A. Smith, *Expositor*, July, 1906, p. 10, admits some dislocation.

presuppose any very considerable lapse of time from the events themselves. The interval separating Ezra's age from that of the compiler is assuredly not greater than the interval between many of the earlier writings and the events they record. The reason for the transference is generally apparent. A view or theory of the past is represented which cannot stand the test of criticism, and if the anomalies are patent, it may be that the ancient "theory" has left its mark elsewhere upon the narratives of the period. We may perceive also that the aims of the historians were didactic, and that their historical insight was on a level with that of the great majority of early writers. It is evident that they did not hesitate to use historical material freely for definite purposes. But criticism is embarrassed by the discovery of such methods since the transference may be accompanied by subsequent redaction and amplified by later accretion to such an extent that the recovery of the earlier forms of the traditions may be practically impossible[1].

[1] As an apparent example of the free use of material it may be noticed that 1 Kings xv. 15 is now unintelligible, but the statement appears in a suitable context in vii. 51, and proves to belong to a narrative of the temple. Further, 2 Kings xi. sq. and xxii. sq. are closely related (cp. xii. 4 sqq. with xxii. 4 sqq.), and again the temple is concerned. Hence, there may have been a self-contained history of the sanctuary (Wellhausen). Now, it is singular that in xxii. 3 arrangements are made for the repair of the temple in the *eighteenth* year (of Josiah), whereas in xii. 6, in the *twenty-third* year (of Jehoash), the work is still incomplete; note the king's reproof, ver. 7. The literary evidence alone (cp. also xi. 14, 17 with xxiii. 2 sq.) is naturally inconclusive, but it would almost appear as though the compilers drew upon this temple-history and adjusted it to their needs where necessary. See below, p. 138, n. 1. An apparent example of duplication may be found in the Aramaean wars of this same period. Under Jehu, a period of peace (2 Kings viii. 12 points to the future) is followed by the *beginning* of the wars (x. 32). After many disasters, Israel gains victories and peace is concluded (cp. xiii. 25 with 1 Kings xx. 34). Elisha's reproof and the judgement upon Ahab (xiii. 19; cp. 1 Kings xx. 35-43) have the same motive, and the former implies that Syria will reappear. This is actually pre-supposed in the victories of Jeroboam II, and the previous situation of Israel as implied in xiii. 5 *b* may be illustrated by the situation in 1 Kings xxii (especially vers. 17, 25). But all the Aramaean wars of Ahab are difficult. The last battles of Ahab and of Jehoram (cp. 1 Kings xxii, *Samaria*, and 2 Kings viii. 28 sqq. *Jezreel*) are virtually doublets, both are without a sequel (as regards the Aramaeans), and are difficult to reconcile with the events of 854 and 842. This variation between Samaria and Jezreel underlies the story of Naboth's vineyard (cp. also 2 Kings x. 1, 11, 17), and is associated with 1 Kings xxii. 38 *b* as contrasted with xxi. 29. See further, p. 152, n. 2.

The *historicity* of a journey from the Red Sea to Sinai cannot be denied on the grounds that the documents belong to a later stage. Although narratives may appear to be untrustworthy in their present form and context, it is *probable* that they are not the result of invention, and it is *possible* that the elements are correct, or that the compiler's general position is trustworthy. Manifestly, every case must be considered on its merits, and only historical criticism can determine whether the continuity has been broken. Thus, it must be recognized that narratives, however unreliable as they now stand, are doubly serviceable: first, for the light they throw upon the intention of the compiler and his historical views, and second, for their inherent value when considered in the light of the context or period to which they properly belong[1]. It is far from unlikely that the knowledge of early relations with Babylonia or of the early history of Egypt influenced the story of an Abram and Amraphel or of a Joseph, and the notice of the relative age of Zoan and Hebron (Num. xiii. 22)—whether correct or not is a secondary matter—is a valuable hint for the existence of some kind of tradition upon which Israelite writers could work. So, again, although the story of Zerah the Cushite probably refers to an invasion of Arab tribes, it is not unlikely that the compiler knew of the tradition that the Egyptian king, Uasarkon II, invaded Palestine, and that he used a narrative which appeared to be suitable—regardless of chronological niceties and other details. In an over-anxiety to decide the historicity of every narrative, there is apt to be a tendency to ignore the methods of compilers, and these, for a study which is yet in its infancy, are often quite as instructive as the facts of history itself[2].

Obviously, the discovery of an historical element, or the proof of the accuracy of the compiler's general position, cannot substantiate

[1] It is the work of literary criticism to determine the extent of the redaction in the course of such transference, and to consider whether two narratives originally contiguous may have influenced each other (cp. e. g. the relation between Exod. xxxiii and Num. xi, see above, p. 71, and below, p. 128, n. 1). Textual corruption, also, may be doubly useful as illustrating both prevailing and earlier opinions (e. g. 2 Sam. vii. 23), and textual confusion itself is sometimes extremely suggestive of the alteration of earlier tradition (see pp. 50 sqq., 89, n. 3).

[2] To avoid misunderstanding it should be added, perhaps, that the above conjecture regarding Zerah is only the first stage in inquiry (viz. the compiler's meaning and intention); there are naturally other questions, e.g. the historicity of an *Arabian* invasion in Asa's day; the relation between 2 Chron. xiv, xvi. 7–10; the period when Israelite writers would have access to Egyptian traditions, &c.

the genuineness of the entire narrative. The occurrence of historical names is no guarantee of historical truth, and this principle is to be recognized not only when Gen. xiv is in question, but in narratives reputedly historical. Thus, if the early writers knew that the Philistines entered Palestine at an early date, and if research has recovered the period of the early settlements of the Purusati, we cannot infer that those narratives which are relegated to the correct period are necessarily authentic. It happens that Gen. xxvi. 1 falls outside the limits, Exod. xiii. 17 may lie within; the group of stories relating to the great Philistine oppression before the monarchy may at least point to the recollection of an epoch-making invasion, but their authenticity is not necessarily assured thereby.

Since it is known that the O. T. contains narratives relating to the history of many centuries in sources of different periods (primarily undefined), it is evident that the first duty is not the extraction of history, but the recovery of their natural interpretation[1]. To be fair, allowance must be made for the fallibility of early historians, and for the scanty nature of the evidence. But, to be consistent, the evidence should at least be subjected to that examination which the theories of modern criticism rightly undergo[2]. Nevertheless, there is often a natural inclination to read the sources in the light of preconceptions, to adjust step by step each detail to individual standpoints, and to reject or ignore data which are found to conflict with a more prevalent view[3].

The whole trend of O. T. history amply shows that there were different circles of thought and varying standpoints. Thus, it would be premature to attempt to decide upon individual details until the body of evidence had been surveyed as a whole. Literary criticism has recognized that the prevailing views where religion and law were

[1] Cp. Langlois and Seignobos, *Introduction to the Study of History*, pp. 143 sq.

[2] For example, the theory that the story of Sheba is impossible after the revolt of Absalom rests, in the first instance, on ordinary historical criticism, and *literary* objections are beside the mark (see p. 117, below). Budde's questions (*Sam.*, p. 296): where were the Philistines? where was Abner? &c., miss the point, but this method of cross-examination is precisely that which must be directed towards the present traditions in turn. (On the theory, see above, pp. 14, 17; Meyer, *op. cit.*, 484, n. 3; Luther, ibid., 188, 195.)

[3] This is exemplified in the attempts to refute the critical view of the development of the Israelite laws, *and equally* when the objections to one critical theory are based upon another theory. A theory cannot be refuted by another theory, although (e. g. in the case of the date of P) the cumulative effect of evidence may be so strong that it overrides other evidence which otherwise appears to be trustworthy.

concerned are not necessarily the oldest; but they are precisely those which later writers or compilers desired their readers to accept. Historical criticism must be similarly guided.

When the traditions of Saul mention Judah (1 Sam. xi. 8, xv. 4) or Jerusalem (1 Sam. xvii. 54), the obvious inclination is to excise or emend, although is it not conceivable that the king to whom great victories were ascribed (xiv. 47 sqq.) might have been credited with having reigned over South Palestine? Thus, there is the possibility that these traditions ignored the situation which *other* traditions represent. So, also, the inclination to read "ephod" for "ark" in 1 Sam. xiv. 18, 1 Kings ii. 26, would be influenced by narratives which conflict with the representation in other passages, although it is obvious that elsewhere there are contradictory traditions of the ark (Judges xx. 27, contrast 1 Sam. iv. 3). As a matter of principle, it seems unmethodical to *force* a narrative into agreement with the history of the period, unless it unmistakably has the required historical background, and does not belong to another cycle of tradition. The natural procedure is to follow up conflicting details and divergent representations to ascertain, if possible, their several connexions and their relative position in the history[1].

Such books as Chronicles and Jubilees prove that the "law of religious historiography" prevailed[2]; with the constant development of thought, the traditions could not remain unchanged. Reforms and innovations based their claim upon ancient authority. That which is to be accepted among the people must be in a certain sense

[1] On the danger of compromising or of reconciling divergences, see Bernheim, 502 sq., Langlois and Seignobos, 198—the method of textual criticism, when MSS. present variant readings, is analogous. For an illustration of divergence of method (David's Jairite or Jattirite priest), see p. 93. It is worth noticing that both Budde and Kennedy suspect interpolation in 1 Sam. xi. 8 (similarly also p. 23 above, note 1), whereas Meyer finds that the high numbers belong essentially to the narrative. Budde, on 1 Sam. xiv. 18, observes that there can be no room for the ark because of vii. 1 (where it is at Kirjath-jearim); Kennedy agrees, but neither offer an adequate explanation of the present text, and both follow the LXX, which has mechanically avoided the inconsistency. H. P. Smith, on the other hand, very properly observes that the writer of xiv. 18 may not have known the other tradition. Needless to say, the practice of reconciling or removing difficulties is one which in Hexateuchal analysis is undertaken only with great caution—in 2 Sam. vii. 6, where another literary theory is concerned, divergence of tradition is recognized (see e.g. Kennedy, ad loc.).

[2] See above, p. 62, and Kuenen, "The Critical Method," *Modern Review*, I (1880), p. 705.

old; it must not be at entire variance with current tendencies, but must represent the old in a new form[1]. The traditions of the past themselves represent the tendencies of the age; they depict former events as they then appeal, and if it is unnecessary to insist upon the recognition of the *development* of tradition, it is nevertheless to be emphasized that the stages are usually neither sudden nor disconnected. For the development of tradition the account of the Exodus is invaluable. Any considerable body of composite documents is instructive for literary and historical criticism, since the results of investigation can be brought to bear upon scantier collections of material elsewhere. From these narratives[2] we see that (*a*) traditions are influenced by social or hierarchical changes, on the principle that the latter are rendered authoritative when a precedent is found for them in the age of Moses. The same principle is one that may well have been put into effect elsewhere, notably at the institution of the monarchy[3]. It is to be observed that in course of time Israel's interest threw itself ever further back into the past. The foundation of the monarchy (as the many traditions show) was once a favourite theme; somewhat later, the historical Psalms prefer to dwell upon the pre-monarchical times, and this tendency finds a still later development in the standpoint of the book of Jubilees. Moreover (*b*), it is extremely suggestive to observe that an older tradition (viz. the journey from Kadesh into Judah) now survives only in the most fragmentary form, because the later compilers and redactors have supplanted it by one which was more popular[4]. It can scarcely be denied that it once existed in a less incomplete form, and it is necessary to allow that (1) any vital or essential detail which is inconsistent with or contradicts the fuller view which now predominates may have existed in a more perfect form[5], and (obviously) that (2) any absolutely isolated piece of evidence does not necessarily represent the only view, or even the true one. It is safe to assert in consequence (3) that no detail, however unique, can be ignored. By itself it may be meaningless—and may provoke the desire to

[1] Cp. with the above, Ibsen on "The Saga and the Ballad," *Contemporary Review*, September, 1906, p. 318. The reference is the more interesting since it shows the value of observing general principles.

[2] See, generally, Section V.

[3] See above, p. 99; cp. also 1 Sam. xxx. 25 for one view of the origin of the law of booty.

[4] See below, p. 122.

[5] Thus it is possible that the charges to Elijah in 1 Kings xix. 15 sqq. are not due to amplification (p. 22, note 2), but point to another representation of the history of that already intricate period.

emend or reconcile—but considered along with others (perhaps equally isolated), the series may constitute an organic body and possess a new importance. It is also instructive to observe that (*c*) although the narratives in Exod. xvi sqq. presuppose a law-giving which is justified by xv. 25 sqq., it is plain that they really refer to the events which follow; there is a certain accuracy of sequence, although the series *as a whole* is untrustworthy. The impression of unity and consecutiveness is thus deceptive[1]. Finally (*d*), among other features which call for notice are: the congregating of successive stages of tradition in the same context, the orderly development of the traditions, the evidence for the extent of literary activity in post-Deuteronomic times, and the closeness of P to the trend of earlier traditions[2].

Literary criticism alone does not suffice to prove the credibility of any document. One narrative may be held to be more or less contemporary because it appears to represent genuine history[3].

[1] See also pp. 14, 99, note 1.

[2] The data are perplexing: Moses requests the help of Hobab, or Jethro lightens his legislative duties (Num. x. 29 sqq., and the parallel Exod. xviii.). But Moses asks also for a divine guide, and as a recipient of the divine spirit chooses seventy elders (Num. xi. 24 sqq.). On Deut. i. 9–18, see p. 71 above. These features are associated with the reluctance of Moses, which in Exod. iv. 13–16 leads to the appointment of Aaron the Levite, and is followed by the journey to Egypt. Here the anger of Yahweh is kindled against Moses, and in other narratives there are allusions to obscure offences by the leaders of the people. Thus, Yahweh is wrath with Moses (Deut. i. 37) after the return of the spies, which at one stage was probably in a context corresponding to Num. xx. 1–13, before the journey from Kadesh (see above, p. 69). Here, however, Caleb is selected (Num. xiii. sq.). Next, Meribah (Kadesh) is the scene of the election of the Levites (Deut. xxxiii. 8–11), and the present passage (Num. xx. 1–13) alludes to some offence by both Moses and Aaron. In Exod. xxxii Aaron alone is guilty (cp. Deut. ix. 20), and the incident leads to the selection of the Levites, but in Deut. x. 6–9 the latter is contemporary with the *death* of Aaron, which is now related in Num. xx, immediately after the "striving" at the waters of Meribah. These intricacies can perhaps be explained if we conceive cycles of traditions dealing with Mosaïte clans, Caleb, Levites, and Aaron; at all events, they point to the fertility of the traditions of this period. The only cycle that survives more or less in its entirety is the late priestly story of the superiority of the younger sons of Aaron over the older, itself a development of the account of Korah's revolt, with its insistence upon the superiority first of Levites over the laity and then of Aaronites over the Levites. See further, pp. 71 sqq.

[3] On 2 Sam. ix-xx, see below, pp. 117 sq., 139, n. 1.

Another, chiefly on linguistic grounds, may be placed some centuries later than the events themselves, but is regarded as a trustworthy representation of the social and religious life, and even of the history of the long-distant past[1]. A third may be separated by as great an interval (on various grounds), but refers to a period which is regarded as unhistorical, and is set upon another plane. It is obvious that only historical criticism can determine whether minuteness and other features are proof of authenticity or not. If there are some who are apt to be dazzled by the term "contemporary," it is plain from the second example that mere contemporaneousness is not indispensable to accuracy. On the other hand, a document, which on literary grounds is held to be late, cannot be condemned for this reason alone. A late record may have had access to good sources, may represent history in a more unbiassed form, and may even represent only a late stage in the development of older tradition[2]. As in textual criticism, greater antiquity does not guarantee greater truth, and the oldest narrative (or manuscript) does not necessarily contain the oldest tradition (or text). On general grounds, the traditions in any late source may be based upon older material quite as reputable as that in earlier sources; and an insignificant period may separate the earliest portions of the late books from the latest portions of those which were completed at an earlier date[3]. Didactic writers will deal freely with their material, but their tendencies can usually be readily recognized. Consequently it is of importance to determine whether their methods were such as would influence their representation of tradition, and if it is found that they manipulated material, it will be a heroic step to maintain that they *invented* it. It is scarcely conceivable that a writer who wished to inculcate certain lessons should fortify himself by inventing his examples or even by using traditions which were at variance with popular belief. We have only to point to the judgment frequently passed

[1] On the old stories of the "judges", see below, p. 116, n. 1.

[2] The chronicler's version of Jehoshaphat's expedition to Ophir (2 Chron. xx. 35-37), in spite of his ships that went to Tarshish, is probably to be preferred to the fragment in 1 Kings xxii. 46-49 (Benzinger, Kittel, Skinner). Jehoshaphat was doubtless a partner, not only of Ahaziah (who reigned only a year), but also of Ahab, and the compiler in Kings has apparently altered the tradition from patriotic motives. That the intervention of the prophet Dodavahu may rest on older tradition is also probable (see the present writer, *Expositor*, Aug. 1906, pp. 191 sq.).

[3] The principle may be expressed as above in general terms; it becomes more cogent when we recall that the dates of the earlier sources are not fixed with any precision.

upon the Book of Chronicles. Here, since the same compiler is responsible also for the present form of Ezra and Nehemiah, it is obvious that all books must be "tarred by the same brush," although the attitude of criticism is often not consistently maintained towards the three. But the chronicler's recognized tendencies do not and could not affect a number of details which are very commonly ignored. His most "unhistorical" tendencies represent a development already found in earlier books, and to treat as worthless those traditions which cannot be controlled is to ignore both the scantiness of the earlier sources and the late survival of old literature, and presupposes a miraculous birth of legend for which no justification has as yet been found.

Literary criticism has already recognized that there was a tendency to emphasize the activity of religious figures in political history. The tendency to frame semi-historical stories in which the religious and didactic element predominates over the secular or political finds a late development in those "Words" upon which the chronicler has drawn. This feature continues to grow beyond his period; it was not a sudden growth, and the germs are already found in earlier writings. The deeds or "words" of Shemaiah or of Iddo appear to have been stories in which these figures were prominent; it cannot be assumed that they are entirely due to late "invention." Also, it can readily be believed that there were similar "words" of Samuel, Nathan, and Gad (1 Chron. xxix. 29), and one may even form some idea of their probable character. Consequently, it would be arbitrary to draw a sharp line of demarcation between those narratives in *earlier* books where seers and prophets play an important part, and that *later* development exemplified in the "words" used by the chronicler.

The date of a narrative or source only gives us the date at which the contents appear. Like the laws in D or P they may have existed for an indefinite period (in oral form or in some lost written record); they may have undergone ordinary development, or they may be influenced by some new tendency. Some kinds of tradition are as inveterate as tribal law or custom, but most are of a variable nature, dependent upon political conditions, tribal relations, and a variety of other factors. Unless we are assured that our tradition is of a kind to remain unchanged, the ease with which the traditional element grows and develops cannot be overlooked. Past events may be preserved partly in writing and partly in popular tradition. Thus they may be transmitted in different forms which could nevertheless be contemporary. If we consider the mass of traditional lore which must have existed in ancient Israel, it is evident that we

cannot assume that an allusion in any early writer proves that the tradition to which he refers existed in writing or even in the form in which it is now preserved. In addition to this, it is important to compare the written traditions in order to determine whether they undergo marked development or are comparatively immutable, and it is necessary to test the general chronological relation between the sources and the period to which they refer. Ultimately, the literary features of the sources where traditions diverge become of considerable value for historical criticism [1].

The ancient historical writer uses sources not necessarily of the same age. We are absolutely dependent upon the material he has left, and are under the influence of the form in which it has been

[1] In the account of the Exodus there are several cycles of tradition which reach their final form in the post-exilic strata; one may infer that several sources had been in existence (see above, p. 113, note 2). In the stories of the patriarchs, on the other hand, the variation is comparatively slight, although J, E, and P appear to extend over many centuries. The old stories of the "judges" seem to have been found in two sources which were drawn from oral tradition, and, according to the ordinary view, are some centuries later than the date of the events. A few centuries later the Deut. redactor leaves the narratives undeveloped, although the traditions of the invasion *appear* to have undergone considerable growth in the meanwhile. If the stories of the "judges" represent the conditions faithfully, and if popular recollection was preserved in spite of the Philistine oppressions, the foundation of the monarchy, and the civilization of a Solomon, &c., the literary theory that they belong to the ninth century may or may not be correct, but it cannot be supported by the view that the knowledge of the early conditions could "hardly have been possessed by an author of the eighth century after the changes which two centuries of the kingdom and of rapidly advancing civilization had wrought" (Moore, *Judg.*, p. xxvii). We have yet to assure ourselves that this conception of Israelite development is correct, and that the civilization had not been already in the land from of old. In the books of Samuel, Budde finds in his E indications of a more romantic tendency as contrasted with his J (*Comm. Sam.*, p. xix), but obviously if there is *any* development of popular tradition between the times of J and E—what must it have been between J and the dates of the actual events? Kennedy, too, confidently ascribes the two older sources, C (the Court-history) and M (the earliest account of the monarchy, &c.), to the tenth century, but already M is held to contain incidents which "reflect rather the plastic mould of popular tradition, and a greater distance from the events than we find in C" (*Sam.*, p. 21). Has literary criticism taken into account the relation between the dates ascribed to the sources and the character of the traditions?

arranged. We can no longer hope to recover the sources he used, but fortunately he reproduces his material regardless of internal contradictions and the like. *His* criticism is apparent where his specific aims are in question; in his attention to his theme he passes over the various difficulties which enable modern criticism to perform its labours. Since a writer *can* include discrepant details in one source, it would be unmethodical to ignore or obscure their presence because the source appears to be a literary unit. For historical criticism, whether the literary features be present or not, apparent unity is no safe guide. But where compilation is already recognized (e.g. by linguistic data, &c.), change of source always provokes deeper inquiry. It is necessary to determine whether the underlying sources do or do not represent the same historical situation. Sometimes each source must be taken separately, or the gaps in one are to be filled from the other. Even where one may be a very late source, it may enable us to recover the original trend of the earlier which it has endeavoured to replace. It would appear from certain examples that the compilers or editors had a method in replacing one source by another, consequently the lateness of a narrative may be of little importance in the preliminary attempt to investigate the course which earlier traditions took.

A conspicuous example of the suggestiveness of purely *literary* criticism is afforded by the present structure of Judges and 2 Samuel. It is very generally agreed that the Deuteronomic editor placed a collection of older stories in his own characteristic framework (Judges ii. 6–xvi. 31); and that those passages which are not marked by his hand, although apparently ignored, were replaced by another editor at a subsequent date. Similarly, it has been held that the Deut. redactor ignored certain chapters, including the whole of the court-history (2 Sam. ix-xx), but these, too, were inserted by a later and more liberal hand. The reasons adduced to explain the omission partly prove too much, and partly are not sufficiently comprehensive, but there can be little doubt that Prof. Budde is correct in ascribing the present passages to post-Deuteronomic activity[1]. Now let us observe the significance of these results. The court-history is unanimously taken to be an almost contemporary narrative, and it is obvious that it must be by one who was in a position to obtain some remarkably intimate details, or, like other narratives of equal vividness, it reflects "the plastic mould of popular tradition." Like the old stories of the "judges," could it not be based upon oral tradition? Naturally, if once it appears probable

[1] On the assumption that 2 Sam. v–viii, in its present form, is due to a Deuteronomic editor.

that it is not a unit, the whole will require fresh and unbiassed investigation. If we accept the unanimous view, however, we perceive that the court-history of David represents traditions of (let us say) the tenth century; these are unchanged in the age *after* the Deuteronomic redaction, whereas the Davidic traditions appear in Chronicles in a highly developed form which is held to be unhistorical. In like manner, the record of the invasion in Judges i, although some centuries after the event, is unanimously taken to be thoroughly trustworthy; it is reinserted in the post-Deut. age, whereas in Joshua the tradition of the invasion seems to appear in another dress. Two traditions at a given age can vary widely, but it is obvious that some adequate explanation is necessary to account for the above features. It is of course possible that the hand which replaced Judges i ignored the very different representation which the account in Joshua affords, but it will probably be admitted that the historical significance of the literary process cannot be ignored[1].

There are other points to notice. Is it assumed that the *language* did not change in the course of those centuries? The court-history at all events must be the current Hebrew after the Deut. redaction, and since the books of Samuel were essentially of a popular character, we gain some idea of the purity of the language in the exilic period. But with it we must contrast the marked linguistic peculiarities of the priestly code or of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah. What is the bearing of the literary-critical conclusion upon ordinary views of the development and decadence of Hebrew? It may be that

[1] It is always difficult to determine whether compilers paid due regard to the suitability of old material for their age, or whether they copied slavishly. It is obvious that "unto this day", in 2 Chron. viii. 8, xxi. 10, is of no value for the date of Chronicles; but may we feel sure that in 1 Kings ix. 21, 2 Kings viii. 22, and elsewhere, the phrase is a safe criterion? Through indiscriminate use of available material 2 Chron. xv. 17, xx. 33 hopelessly contradict xiv. 5, xvii. 6, but in one case the old source remains unchanged, and in the other old traditions had already been developed. In 2 Chron. ix. 11 the old reading (in 1 Kings x. 12) has been altered to prevent misunderstanding. What is to be made of the chronicler's "Arabians"? Are they due to ignorance of the earlier history, or has an older ethnic been altered to make the record intelligible to late readers? If the latter, the fact that "Arabians" are associated with the Philistines will suggest that earlier sources named "Edomites," and the necessity for the change will be obvious, since at a later period that name would suggest a people to the south of Judah. Elsewhere, however, where old sources are copied, "Edom" is retained, thus affording another illustration of lack of discrimination.

language and linguistic peculiarities are characteristic of circles or of schools; at all events, it cannot be argued that Deut. represents the current language of its day, since post-Deut. writings are not necessarily influenced by its vocabulary or even by its thought [1].

If a post-Deut. hand was able to reinsert the old narratives, we must assume that old copies continued to survive to a late date [2]. Therefore, it is impossible to deny on *a priori* grounds that written traditions of the monarchical period existed in the late post-exilic period, e. g. in the chronicler's age. Again, it is naturally impossible to determine what variant traditions these copies embodied, and it is certain that, when once we have to admit that narratives have been reinserted in a post-Deut. period, literary criticism alone cannot decide whether the present narratives agree with those which are supposed to have been ignored.

It is manifest that these literary results are distinctly opposed to mechanical methods of O. T. criticism. At the least it is clear that the structure of Judges and of 2 Samuel presupposes the survival of older literature which escaped the Deut. redaction. Moreover, a comparison of the narrative portions of Deuteronomy with Exodus and Numbers *suggests* that there were other forms of earlier narratives apart from those which have been embodied, and, at the same time, proves the great extent of post-Deut. activity. From a comparison of the Massoretic text with the LXX it is evident that there was a very considerable fluctuation of tradition down to a very late date. Finally, a comparison of Exod. xxxv-xl with the LXX and the Samaritan Pentateuch is enough to show that the date of the Samaritan schism is not a decisive *terminus ad quem* for the criticism of the Pentateuchal problems. Accordingly, when we consider (*a*) the great variety of early tradition, of which only a portion has been preserved; (*b*) the late survival of early material in good classical Hebrew, uninfluenced by previous redaction; and (*c*) the ease with

[1] Moreover, the Deut. hand does not necessarily leave its mark in the writings it incorporates, even where the subjects of Deut. reform are in question (e. g. the altar in Judges vi. 24; cp. also the priests in 2 Sam. viii. 18). It is noteworthy that there is little variation in classical Hebrew *as a whole* when contrasted with the phenomena which at once disclose themselves in the language of such close neighbours as the Moabites. J and E, for example, are very closely akin, although narratives which were certainly written in Central or Northern Palestine have marked peculiarities. Cp. Judges v and the cycle of stories of Elijah and Elisha (the latter are Samarian, they scarcely proceed from a more northerly district).

[2] Cp. Moore, *Intern. Crit. Comm.*, *Judges*, p. xxx.

which written sources could be rendered complex by casual redaction, it is evident that internal *literary* criticism must somewhere reach its limits. But, if these considerations will persuade some that the evidence is too scanty and intricate for *historical* criticism, it may convince others of the danger of accepting too readily the precise arrangement of the material or the particular representations which have been handed down.

Not only can earlier writings escape redaction, and thus be free from the tendencies of specific redaction, but the religious ideals and reforms which appear in the history do not necessarily represent the current stage of popular thought. They may indicate the high-water mark of opinion, but the popular religion is wont to lag sadly behind. Unless we know the circle from which a writing emanates we can scarcely tell *a priori* by what factors it would be influenced. Even ethical or sociological data are not decisive unless one can trace the development in the light of history. At any given period two contiguous circles may be separated by a gulf which will be reflected in the traditions of each, and a narrative with all the traces of primitive thought may even be later than one which proceeds from a more advanced circle. Many apparent criteria of this kind are of no chronological value. There are fine conceptions in pre-Israelite records, whilst Jubilees, despite its advanced colour, retains anthropomorphisms, primitive explanations of names, the popular sayings regarding the tribes, and takes no offence at the building of altars (vi. 1, xiii. 4, xxxi. 26)[1]. The essential character of the popular thought of its day is thus clearly manifest.

It is naturally helpful for the study of the conflict between nomad (or pastoral) and agricultural life and for the subsequent fusion of custom to observe the process at other periods or upon other soil, but it can hardly be assumed that for the O. T. we are confined to the *one* great wave of invasion with which the history of Israel begins. It cannot be summarily denied that there were posterior movements which could affect the traditions, and we can scarcely neglect the possibilities suggested by the evidence for the infusion of new blood in Samaria. Thus, it is especially interesting to recall Sargon's statement that the conquered Arab tribes of the desert (Tamud, Ḫayapa, &c.) were settled in the land of Beth-Omri (*Annals*, 94; *Cyl. Inscr.*, 20). This was about 715 B.C., and when we consider the usual result of the fusion of tribes and the relatively early date as compared with the literary history of the O. T., it is clear that

[1] So, also, narratives which appear to be life-like and truthful pictures of the past state of society to which they are relegated may represent conditions equally suitable to a much later date.

a purely general consideration of this nature is extremely suggestive for its bearing upon the internal conditions in Samaria[1].

These notes on literary and historical criticism may be summed up in a very few words[2]. We have the records of a people which spread itself over Palestine, written with a purpose, and under the influence of varying ideas and standpoints. Also, they are the result of an intricate literary process, and allowance must be made for the character of the evidence whether taken as a whole or in the investigation of particular portions. But methods of criticism must be applied consistently, and the bearing of literary conclusions upon the history, and the converse, must be steadily observed. From a preliminary literary criticism one proceeds to historical criticism, and thence one returns to the re-investigation of the literary material in the light of history. In the end, however, we have to do with products of human thought, and the fundamental unity of the human mind widens the range by compelling us to pursue the interpretation of the O. T. in the light of comparative study in other fields.

[1] On general grounds, also, the survey of Israel's history suggests significant periods which would influence literary activity. It is reasonable to expect that the rebuilding of the temple of Jerusalem inspired new aims and hopes which would leave their mark upon the writings of the time. The differences between the pre-Ezran and post-Ezran periods are so profound that it might almost be taken for granted that they would show themselves in the treatment of past history. Literary criticism has already laid its finger upon the characteristics *after* the institution of Judaism on the lines of Ezra, and there are some signs that critics are beginning to recognize waves of activity in the preceding stage. See R. H. Kennett, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1905, p. 184 (on the union of J and E), 1906, pp. 481 sqq. (on the date of Deuteronomy).

[2] See also pp. 31, 46 sq., 59 sqq., 62 sq., and 67, note 1. It need scarcely be stated that these notes make no pretence whatever of being a systematic exposition of principles. They merely arise out of the preceding sections and bear upon the pages which follow.

VIII. Saul and David.

In our investigation of the early periods of Israelite history we have dealt independently with David (in 2 Samuel), with Saul and his relations to David, Samuel and Benjamin, and with the traditions of the Exodus. For the last-mentioned, the essential and vital detail is the recognition of the original pre-eminence of Kadesh[1]. This rests upon good evidence, and it was found that a number of narratives, which are now in other contexts, appear to have been originally associated with the sacred site. It is intelligible that its prominence should agree with the existence of early local stories, and that the later but more prevalent representation wherein Sinai becomes important should have involved subsequent redaction and rearrangement. If the evidence is sound, it would obviously be contrary to method to ignore the conclusion *because* it conflicts with another tradition, or to propose a provisional compromise in order to maintain a certain unity in the narratives.

There are *independent* grounds for the conclusion that an old tradition knew of a movement from Kadesh into Judah[2]. It survives in a fragmentary form because it has been supplanted by the prevailing theory that all the Israelites entered Palestine from the east under the leadership of Joshua. But it is intrinsically improbable that the conquest was delayed at the very gate of the promised land in order to expiate a fault, yet upon the story of the spies and the disobedience of the Israelites the more familiar tradition now hangs. The natural sequel to the *victory* over the Canaanites at Hormah is lost; we find instead unsuccessful overtures to Edom followed by a détour. This détour is anticipated by a precise command (Num. xiv. 25) which is

[1] See Section V (above, pp. 62–83); also Wellhausen, *Prolegomena* (Eng. trans.), pp. 342 sqq.; Stade, *Entstehung d. Volkes Israel*, pp. 12 sqq.; Guthe, *Encyc. Bib.*, col. 2222; Moore, ib. 1443 (v); Gray, ib. 5257 sqq.; H. P. Smith, *O. T. Hist.*, pp. 62 sqq.; Paton, *Syria and Palestine*, pp. 138 sqq.; Kent, *Beginnings of Hebrew History*, p. 206, and others.

[2] See above, pp. 38 sq., 80 sq., and compare Wellhausen, p. 354; Moore, *Internat. Crit. Comm.*, *Judges*, pp. 12, 23, 31, *Encyc. Bib.*, col. 2608, 3443; H. W. Hogg, ibid., col. 4526 (§ 4); H. P. Smith, pp. 83 sq.; Kent, p. 219; Steuernagel, *Einwanderung*, pp. 76 sq. The references in this and the preceding note could be multiplied, but they will probably suffice to show that some of the more important features in the present inquiry are already recognized.

enforced by the *defeat* which Israel suffered from the Amorites or Amalekites near Hormah. Accordingly the people turn back to the Yam Sûph and journey northwards to Shittim. The latter move is intelligible in itself, but the retreat from Kadesh has little probability and could be due to the attempt to reconcile a journey from Kadesh northwards with one from Ezion-geber along the eastern border of Edom and Moab.

Of these two main representations little of the former remains, although the prominence of Kadesh is enough to suggest its original importance. This invasion from the south (S) and the more prevalent tradition that the Israelites entered central Palestine from the east (C)[1] have influenced each other in course of development. Thus the story of Caleb has been conformed to C—as though the victory at Hormah (between Kadesh and Beersheba) was followed by a circuitous route via Ezion-geber, Shittim, and Gilgal; and the reverse process can be recognized when *Israelites* are the victors at Hormah, and when Joshua takes part in a defeat of Amalek (Exod. xvii) which, in its proper context, should be in the course of a movement from Kadesh northwards[2]. Joshua, in point of fact, hardly finds a place in the oldest traditions of S; he is the hero of C, and his appearance in the Exodus is probably due to that fusion and concentration which not rarely results whenever distinct traditions are blended.

It is clear that there are many "motives" which could and probably did affect the growth of these traditions, and although they may explain the present complicated literary character of the sources, the successive stages cannot, perhaps, be satisfactorily traced[3]. The extent of redaction which the laws alone presuppose, the possibilities of fusion—and of confusion—suggested by the terms "Goshen" and "Yam Sûph," the probability of subsequent migrations from the south (with blending of tradition), and the bearing of the political history of Edom and Moab upon the scenes of the narratives are factors of importance. There *appears* to be no old evidence to connect Kadesh with Egypt, but if the story of Joseph and the removal of his bones to Shechem (cp. also Jacob in Gen. l) could influence C, tribes from the south of Palestine were in close contact with Egyptian life at certain periods; and if the probability of the extension of the term Mizraim (Egypt) to the gulf of 'Akabah be doubted, close trading-con-

[1] For the sake of brevity these will be designated S and C.

[2] See pp. 38 sq., 81 sq.

[3] This intricacy, contrasted with the relative simplicity (whether apparent or real) of other groups of narratives elsewhere, is in many respects suggestive; especially instructive is the extent of the *post-Deuteronomic* redaction, and the continued growth of post-exilic tradition.

nexions between Egypt and Arabia can hardly be denied. It is worth noticing, also, that the father of a priest of Têma in an Aramaean inscription of the fifth century B. C. bears an Egyptian name; thus implying relations which naturally were not confined to that late date alone[1].

Now this account of the movement from Kadesh in S is closely bound up with a number of other traditions. The Kadesh-cycle introduces Caleb, Dan (viz. Aholiab), Simeon, Mosaïte clans (Hobab, Jethro, Kenites) and the ark. Later we meet with Caleb expelling the Anakites from Hebron and with Kenites in the negeb of Judah. The district around Bethlehem becomes associated partly with the later seats of southern clans, and partly (on genealogical and geographical grounds) with the southern home of Danites. Bethlehem itself is connected with Levites in Judges xvii. 9, xix. 1, and in xviii. 3 previous intercourse with Danites is implied. The Levites bear a class-name evidently later than the origin of the caste, their traditions take them back to Kadesh, their genealogies connect them both with clans of the south and with the family and kin of Moses. A Levite priest accompanies the Danites north; Simeon and Levi are associated with Shechem, and a Kenite clan is found in Naphtali. In course of time the Levites are spread over Palestine. David himself has relations with the south, Abiathar his priest (for the name, cp. Jether-Jethro) shares his wanderings and carries with him the ark, the installation of which reads like a climax and is regarded as such in Chronicles

[1] See *Corp. Inscr. Semit.*, ii. 113 (also Meyer, p. 450), and, for general remarks, pp. 64, n. 1, 95, n. 1. The sites of Sinai and Horeb may be left open. It is of course "impossible to see why a people whose objective point was Canaan should have marched in the opposite [or in any other] direction" (Kent, p. 381); but one cannot bend the evidence to suit our historical judgment. Exod. xiii. 17 proposes to take the people away from possible warfare, but no sooner were they in Kadesh than war broke out, and the district (comparing Gen. xx. 1 with xxvi. 1) *could* be viewed as Philistine. The verse is probably intended to prepare the way for the introduction of Sinai; with it (ver. 19) belongs one of the very few references to the removal of Joseph's bones (which should have played an important part in the traditions of the Joseph tribes). In building up the journey of Sinai much rearrangement of material has been involved (see above, p. 78 sq., also p. 107). It may be added that, on literary grounds, it has been doubted whether J knew of Sinai (Kuenen, *Hex.*, pp. 157 sq.), and that the Sinaitic laws are clearly less primitive than those which underlie Exod. xxxiv. The latter are closely associated with S, and Moore (*Encyc. Bib.* 1446) suggests that they were probably made at a Judaean sanctuary (see below, p. 152, n. 2). Naturally, not *all* the Sinai traditions are based upon those of Kadesh (see p. 79, n. 1).

(2 Sam. vii. 6 sqq.; 1 Chron. xxiii. 26). Ultimately the Levites are collected around Jerusalem, and David (whose traditional home is Bethlehem) is regarded as the organizer of the caste. It is in this district that we are bidden to look for the families of the scribes (1 Chron. ii. 55).

Moreover the genealogy of "Hezron" in 1 Chron. ii comprises Caleb and Jerahmeel, and extends even to the east of the Jordan where the ancestor takes to wife the daughter of Machir the father of Gilead. The Davidic traditions presuppose relations with Moab and Gilead which (on the ordinary view and in their present context) are difficult to understand. Finally, the traditions of the exodus in P suggest that there may have been a movement *from Kadesh* direct to the east of the Jordan, and the last narrative fragment in Num. xxxii. 39 sqq. actually relates the conquests of Machirites in Gilead[1].

Thus we have here a number of details, apparently isolated, connected with Kadesh, Bethlehem, the Levites, and with David the maker of Judah. They appear in narratives which have been ascribed to all ages, and it is perfectly plain that some of them are quite untrustworthy. But they are linked together in such a manner that the results of literary criticism cannot enable us to draw the dividing line between fact and fancy, between authentic tradition and later reflection. It is well known that the ordinary "Israelite" traditions contain many unhistorical and exaggerated elements, and similarly S must be recognized as a body of tradition of unequal value. For the present it is evident that S must be kept quite distinct from the "Israelite" invasion from the east.

In turning to the Book of Joshua, the first noteworthy feature is the distinctive literary process which marks it off sharply from the Pentateuch. The Priestly hand which dominates the earlier books has scarcely left a mark in chaps. i-xii which narrate the invasion, whereas in the latter part it devotes considerable space to the tribal divisions. On the other hand, the Deuteronomic writer is found to prevail in the first half, and the literary evidence has suggested that there was "a Deuteronomic history of Israel from the invasion of Palestine to the establishment of the kingdom[2]." For historical criticism the oldest traditions are noteworthy. They comprise local detailed stories of attacks upon Jericho, Ai, and Bethel, and two fights of greater significance against united foes in the south and in the north. The conquest of central Palestine itself, although not de-

[1] See generally, for the evidence, Section VI, and, further, for Caleb, pp. 81-3; for Dan, pp. 40 sqq.; for P in Numbers, p. 80 sq. (and Gray, *Numbers*, p. 282), and for S in east Jordan, pp. 92 sqq.

[2] Moore, *Encyc. Bib.*, col. 2602 (§ 4).

scribed, is obviously implied in these latter, but the failure to supply the expected information should not be overlooked. It is true that the campaigns in x sq., in their present form, are due to exaggeration and generalization, but we can scarcely reject the older kernel[1] —it can hardly be less valuable than other records (e. g. stories of the judges) which, on the current view, are separated by several centuries from the events themselves. Some place must be found for Joshua's achievements, and it is possible that they are traditions of central Palestine—of the extension of a people who had already taken possession of the land[2].

It is very doubtful whether Joshua found a place in the oldest traditions in Exodus or Numbers, and there is no decisive connecting link between the earlier strata of his book and the wanderings in the wilderness. Hence it is safer to keep each distinct. It is to be recognized that we have to deal with an invasion from beyond the Jordan, but it is not easy to associate it either with Kadesh or even with a journey from Ezion-geber[3]. Central Palestine (with connexions east of the Jordan) is also the general standpoint in certain of the stories of the "judges," but the original links (both historical and literary) between the books of Joshua and of Judges are no longer clear. The "judges" carry us down to Jephthah—Samson is a Danite figure—and again the continuity is broken[4]. If, as Budde argues, the stories of Jephthah, Eli, and Samuel belong to the same source, it is obvious that there is a lacuna in the history between the first two, and if the narratives of Samson and the older portions of

[1] Even x. 28 sqq. has underlying old material.

[2] Cp. Guthe's hint, *Encyc. Bib.*, col. 2226. E already knew of the occupation of Shechem (Gen. xxxiii. 19, xlviii. 22). For the account of the invasion in Joshua, some allowance should be made for the possibility of confusion between the Gilgals and for the existence of a variant tradition that Joshua (like Jacob) crossed the Jordan at a more northerly ford (see p. 57).

[3] Some critics do not recognize J in Joshua i–xii, and this may be influenced by historical theories which approximate but are not identical with our view of S. At all events this proves that the literary evidence is not decisive (see Carpenter, *Comp. of Hex.*, p. 376 note, and for general objections to the exclusion of J, Moore, *Encyc. Bib.*, col. 2602, § 6 with references).

[4] Judges ii. 6 compared with Joshua xxiv. 28, and the LXX addition to the Book of Joshua (viz. the introduction to the story of Ehud) point to *possible* earlier forms (on the repetition cp. below, 139, n. 1). Both ignore Judges i which the Deut. redactor omitted (above, p. 117). On the age of the narratives see above, p. 116, n. 1, and for the literary hypothesis that J and E are to be recognized see, e. g., Moore, *Encyc. Bib.*, col. 2635.

1 Sam. iv–vi, and of Saul's rise are a literary unit, it is equally obvious that this will not simplify the work of historical criticism. A writer may naturally link together narratives of distinct origin, but it cannot be denied that in passing from Judges to 1 Sam. there is a gap in the history which the traditions do not allow us to fill. Moreover, the problem of the fortunes of the ark and of the disappearance of Shiloh continue to perplex all those who look beneath the surface. The fall of Shiloh (after the Philistine victory in 1 Sam. vi) is referred to by Jeremiah in terms that show that its fate would appeal forcibly to the priests and prophets of Jerusalem (Jer. vii. 12, xxvi. 6, 9). But it is amazing that Judah could be edified by a disaster which had befallen Israel many centuries previously, and unless the catastrophe were fresh in the minds of the people Jeremiah's words would have little significance. The problem of the history of the ark itself is equally serious[1].

The vital fact for the study of this period is the Philistine oppression from which Saul delivered Israel. It was for this that he was anointed, although no preliminary account of the situation is preserved. On the other hand, a remarkable victory had already been gained by Samuel. But 1 Sam. vii is admitted to be relatively late and unhistorical, although there can be little doubt that some older tradition has been utilized for the purpose[2]. Samuel's great achievement, the prelude to the monarchy, connects itself with the introduction to the period of oppression as set forth in an extremely composite passage in Judges x. 6 sqq.[3] Here, when we find the distress of the Israelites, Yahweh's refusal to help, and their renewed protestations of penitence, and when Yahweh "could bear the misery of Israel no longer" (Judges x. 13–16), it is at once evident that "in the original connexion . . . ver. 16 must have been immediately followed by the raising up of the deliverer" (Moore). So also, when Yahweh declares to Samuel "I have looked upon the affliction of my people because their cry is come unto me" (1 Sam. ix. 16); can one find the prelude either in the wars of ch. iv sqq., or even in the story of Samson? Judges x. 8 sq. refers obscurely to the Israelites who were driven across the Jordan, not by the Ammonites, but apparently by the Philistines (ver. 7). Their position was hopeless (וַתֵּצַר לְיִשְׂרָאֵל מְאֹד). When Saul appears upon

[1] Budde leaves the question open (*Sam.*, p. 32), but it is surely important to know whether the history suddenly leaps from the times of the "judges" into the middle of the monarchic period, and the question has distinct bearing upon the literary problems.

[2] Cp. above, p. 109, and below, p. 143.

[3] See Moore, *Judges*, p. 276; H. P. Smith, *Sam.*, p. 4; Budde, *Sam.*, p. 49.

the scene the people are still in great straits (צַר לוֹ), some had taken refuge in holes and caverns, whilst others had fled to the land of Gad and Gilead (1 Sam. xiii. 6 sq.). Is it not evident that we must allow that either there have been serious omissions (after Judges x and after 1 Sam. vii. 1), or there have been equally serious insertions? The historical difficulties associated with Shiloh and the ark are enough to point to the second alternative, and it is highly probable that if the composite passage in Judges x. 6 sqq. *now* looks forward to Samuel's great victory, in an *earlier* form it was intimately connected with the earlier traditions of the rise of Saul [1].

Drastic though this attempt to recover the original continuity may appear, it cannot be ignored that, of the narratives which intervene some are due to post-Deut. insertion or are relatively late, others deal essentially with another part of Palestine, belong to other cycles of tradition, or represent situations which elude plausible explanation. Moreover, it is manifest that for a correct conception of the times of Saul, we cannot overlook the presence of the non-Israelite district which formed part of (the later) Benjamin and Judah. It is commonly admitted that David's conquest of the Jebusites made free communication possible between the north and south, and that the earlier history was in many ways determined by a barrier of cities of which Jerusalem was only one [2]. But it is necessary to advance further and observe that all the narratives which ignore the situation appear *on other grounds* to be untrustworthy in their present form and context.

This is clear when we consider the traditions of Saul and David. Saul the pious and valiant king, to whose achievements the old poem in 2 Sam. i testifies, is not the Saul who predominates in 1 Samuel, although it is intelligible that the first king of Israel would be

[1] For the break in the continuity cp. the relation between Exod. xxxii–xxxiv and Num. x. 29 sqq. The chief points to be noticed are: the recovery of the oldest traditions in 1 Sam. xiii. sq. (pp. 20 sqq.), the fact that chap. ix recognizes the oppression but ignores the exigencies of the situation (pp. 50–3); the general development of the traditions of Samuel (pp. 26, 33 sq.; the problems of Shiloh and the ark (pp. 36 sqq., 55, n. 2); the Danite migration and its relation to S (pp. 40 sqq.). On the general relation between the intervening subject-matter see pp. 36 sq., 48, and 97 sq. See further, below, pp. 142 sqq.

[2] For the evidence see p. 42 sq. Judges xix. 10 sqq. recognizes that Jerusalem was Jebusite; but 1 Sam. vi. 19–vii. 1 (Beth-shemesh, Kirjath-jearim) obviously stands in need of explanation (cp. above, p. 55, n. 2). Every one feels the difficulty in the mention of Jerusalem in 1 Sam. xvii. 54, but it is singular that Saul's jurisdiction over the Israelite priests of Nob (to the immediate north) rarely excites comment.

a famous figure in central Palestine whatever people in *Judah* may have thought (cp. p. 19). David, on the other hand, was the first to unite north and south, and thus had claims upon both Judah and Israel. He was the founder of Judah and the head of a long dynasty. Whatever may have been the attitude of *Israel* (e. g. after the separation), Judah outlived its neighbour, and Jerusalem ultimately became the centre of a new organization after the exile. Very late tradition idealized David and made of him both saint and poet, and it is freely admitted that some of the later phases which conflict with the earlier are unreliable. But when we consider the earlier representations it is certain that they are not homogeneous. There is (*a*) David the son-in-law of Saul, a popular favourite of Israel, who is forced to flee from the court; he is consistently generous to the ignoble Saul, and closely bound by affection to the chivalrous Jonathan; after their death he becomes king of Hebron, but it is only after the death of Ishbaal that he accedes to popular desire and is made the king of a united people. On the other hand (*b*) there are some passages which find David in the extreme south of Judah, or as a semi-independent chieftain at Ziklag and Gath; he strengthens his position in the south by alliances and by politic gifts, and ultimately reaches the throne after conquering the Jebusites, whose city Jerusalem becomes his capital. The former of these is developed in Chronicles when (*c*) David becomes king after Saul's death, and it actually appears that many of the Israelites had seceded to him during his residence at Ziklag. The growth from *a* to *c* (easily recognized since the sources are quite distinct) is intelligible, but the relation between *a* and *b* (which appear in a series of continuous narratives) is obscured, and at every step there are difficulties of an historical character.

The conclusion that the tendency to idealize David's history has already made its appearance in the earlier books[1] finds support in several independent considerations. As regards 2 Sam., some weight must be laid upon the internal character of those narratives which presuppose close relations between David and Saul's family or Israel. In 1 Sam., apart from the literary evidence (viz. narratives ascribed to E and therefore later than J)[2], we cannot ignore either the varying representations of Saul or the non-Israelite belt of cities. On the one hand, we have Saul every inch a king (1 Sam. xiv. 47–51)[3], a worshipper

[1] Viz. in *a*; see above, pp. 3, 6, 90.

[2] See above, p. 116, n, 1 (end), and below, p. 130, n. 1.

[3] Budde rejects xiv. 47–51, partly on literary grounds and partly because it conflicts with other representations of Saul's life. But if the Song in 2 Sam. i regards the king's death as a crowning misfortune and bears witness to this achievement and to his love for Jonathan, and if it

of Yahweh (ver. 35) and brave, and on the other hand, a petty figure living in a strip of land skirting the alien cities and constantly harassed by the Philistines. The unhappy picture we are apt to draw of him is based upon narratives where David enters into his history. The traditions of David the youth of Bethlehem at the court of Saul of Gibeah, the Benjamite king, ignore this intervening hostile district, yet it is upon this soil that the love sprang up between David and Jonathan, and the shepherd-lad became the idol of the Israelites. Where David's life is handled quite apart from Saul or when Saul is treated independently of David there are different standpoints; where they meet, and where the relations between David and Israel are engendered, it is forgotten that Jerusalem was still Jebusite, and that this city, and no doubt also the immediate neighbourhood, was only taken later by the sword. Moreover, however overpowering may be the bulk of these traditions, we cannot neglect the very different representation of David's attitude to the family of Saul which is preserved in 2 Sam. xxi, and whatever view may be taken of David's steps to the throne the real character of the bond between Judah and Israel must necessarily be judged in the light of later events. "Subsequent history shows how loose was the union of north and south, and the ease with which the separation was effected after a few years of joint rule under David and Solomon . . . favours the view that Judah, previous to the union, had never stood in any close relationship to Israel (or Benjamin)[1]."

is old (as Budde naturally admits), it is surely sounder method to recognize that the traditions conflict than to reject arbitrarily here and there.

[1] See the present writer's "Notes on the Composition of 2 Samuel," in *A. J. S. L.* (*American Journal of Semitic Languages*, XVI, 1900, pp. 145–77). In replying to various criticisms (in particular to Budde's exhaustive discussion in his Commentary), in the first of these sections (pp. 1–18) it is admitted that the attempt to substantiate historical theories by pointing to traces of Ephraimite (or Elohist) redaction was a weakness in the argument. Budde, in his turn, attempts to prove both the literary unity of the narratives and the unity of the history, but is forced to recognize secondary elements in his older source. If it is admitted that one source will merge different representations (*Comm.*, pp. 59, 277, 310), if not all J is historically trustworthy, and if good material can be preserved in E (*Comm.*, p. xx), literary criticism will not carry us far, and the fresh investigation from the standpoint of historical criticism is not excluded. Literary criticism alone has its limits in this case, although one of the most striking results which we owe to Budde is remarkably suggestive (above, pp. 117 sq.), and one of his many keen observations simply revolutionizes our conception of the Davidic traditions (see below,

To understand the bearing of this upon the traditions of David we must notice the situation after the death of Saul. Whether this king had connexions beyond the Jordan or not[1], the Israelites fled eastwards after the battle of Gilboa and the court was set up at Mahanaim, obviously on friendly soil. Jabesh-Gilead, too, showed its gratitude for past benefits. From 2 Sam. ii. 8–10 *a* it appears that Israel so far recovered itself that Ishbaal became king over Palestine north of Jerusalem. Again we notice the redactor's interest in the political history of Israel (cp. 1 Sam. xiv. 47 sqq.). These fragments remind one of the annals which have been used in the book of Kings. They are naturally written each from its own standpoint and record the most important events in the briefest terms. Similarly, here, our passage brings us to one of the most significant points in early history and gives us only the bare recital of the extent of Ishbaal's kingdom[2].

It is commonly understood that Ishbaal reigned in Israel as a vassal of the Philistines whilst David occupied the same ignoble position at Hebron[3]. On the other hand, it is very difficult to explain both the absence of the Philistines in 2 Sam. ii–iv and the scenes of the conflicts which are now placed *after* the capture of Jerusalem. The narratives in ii. 12–iv are of a somewhat popular character[4], and in describing the war which broke out between David and Ishbaal, they recognize the close relations which had subsisted between David and Israel. But it actually appears from the words of Abner in iii. 17 sq. that not only had Israel longed for David, but David himself had been divinely commissioned to deliver Israel from the hands of the Philistines. This is no mere isolated phrase, since, at the close of Absalom's

p. 133; unfortunately the full force of it was not realized until Section VI was in print).

[1] See p. 59.

[2] The source is suddenly closed (see further below, p. 142, n. 1). The chronological note (ii. 10) is at variance with David's chronology (ver. 11) and is consequently rejected or ignored as a gloss! But surely one cannot rest satisfied with this summary rejection of material which happens to conflict with other data. It may be noticed as illustrating the independent standpoints of the Royal Annals that the Israelite account of conflicts with the Philistines ignores Judah (1 Kings xv. 27, xvi. 15; see p. 60), and the Judaean account of Jehoram's troubles (2 Kings viii. 20 sqq.) makes no allusion to the bond that then united the two royal families.

[3] Consequently, David's alliance with a "real" king of the Aramaean Geshur instead of some South Palestinian locality becomes more improbable; see p. 9 sq.

[4] See *A. J. S. L.*, 148 sqq.; and Luther in Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. 194 sq.

revolt, the Israelites recall the debt they owed to David for the benefit which had been conferred upon them by his achievement (xix. 9).

These passages are extremely important, and on their natural interpretation must mean that David was supposed to have accomplished for Israel that which Saul had done in his day[1]. It cannot be said that this representation is historical, it ignores the situation in ii. 8 sq., and it is extremely significant that *Israel* only, and not Judah, is concerned. On the other hand, it is in entire agreement with the circumstance that when David became king over the north, Mephibosheth was not found in Israel (as might have been expected after ii. 8 sq.) but in the care of Machir of Lo-debar. Moreover, it now becomes significant that after the disaster at Gilboa the land was flooded with Philistines and Israel was forced to flee (1 Sam. xxxi. 7). The situation is practically identical with that at the time of Saul's rise (cp. 1 Sam. xiii. 7). Accordingly, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the view prevailed that Israel owed its deliverance from the Philistines not to the first king of Israel, but to the first king of the Judaean monarchy, and that although Saul was anointed to deliver Yahweh's people, his career was a failure, and the work of deliverance was accomplished by David. It is scarcely possible to misunderstand iii. 18, xix. 9, and all that they imply when viewed impartially, and one is thus in a position to recover a specific theory, which, although obviously of secondary origin, may have left its mark upon other narratives[2].

But a state of oppression or even of vassalage ignores the fundamental difficulty that the Philistines appear to be indifferent whilst David was king of Hebron, and are not aroused until Judah and Israel were united. It is hardly conceivable that the relatively small Philistine *pentad* should have acted in this singular manner, and the problem is not simplified by the writer's earlier conclusion that Israel and Judah had been separately engaged in subduing the Philistines in the north and south respectively[3]. The surprising feature is the

[1] Cp. especially 1 Sam. ix. 16: "he shall save my people out of the hand of the Philistines."

[2] 2 Sam. xix. 9 occurs in a passage where Absalom's revolt (primarily a Judaean narrative) has been amplified by the inclusion of Israel (*A.J.S.L.*, 165). iii. 17 sq. has also some marks of a relatively late date, but there seems to be little in ii. 12–iii which is very old (ibid., p. 149). Budde, on the other hand, argues that both passages belong essentially to the context. How a specific theory will influence earlier narratives is seen at its best in the later prominence of Sinai and the redaction that ensued in the account of the Exodus.

[3] *A. J. S. L.*, 150, 152, 154. Wellhausen, too, assumed that Ishbaal had established his dominion "of course in uninterrupted struggle with the Philistines" (*Ency. Brit.*, art. "Israel").

conquest of a *Jebusite* city and conflicts with the *Philistines* – the former belonging to the Canaanite, Amorite or non-Israelite inhabitants, the latter a perplexing race which, though vanquished by David, reappears some centuries later as an independent people[1].

Our sources comprise the older portions of 2 Sam. v–viii, xxi–xxiv, a collection of miscellaneous extracts of the same general character, similar as regards style to the matter in 2 Sam. ii. 1–4*a*, and to the Judaean annals in Kings. Chs. v–viii in their present form constitute a self-contained account of David's history at Jerusalem. In chap. v. 6 sqq. is related the capture of the Jebusite city and on the natural assumption the surrounding district was cleared. In a fight in the valley of Rephaim the "Philistines" were smitten from Gibeon (ver. 25, LXX and Chron.) to Gezer, and were one not influenced by the ethnic it could be inferred that the enemy were Canaanites, Jebusites, or the like. Now, among the stories in xxi, xxiii are the familiar engagements with the giants of Gath. These יְלִידֵי הָרָפָה, by their very designation, associate themselves, as Budde has observed (*Sam.*, p. 310 sq.), with the יְלִידֵי הָעֲנָק whom Caleb overthrew at Hebron. There were traditions which knew of these ancient worthies elsewhere—at Gaza, Ashdod, and at Gath itself (Joshua xi. 21 sq.), and the traditions of Anakites are properly quite distinct from those which people the same district with the more tangible Philistines (ibid., xiii. 3)[2]. It is highly probable, therefore, that in 2 Sam. v–viii, and in certain other cases, the "Philistines" have taken the place of another ethnic[3]. Had David been fighting the Philistines it would be difficult to account for the present dislocation, whereas those conflicts which, on geographical grounds, would have been expected in a context between Hebron and Jerusalem, would naturally clash with other traditions of David's progress[4].

[1] They appear as a new enemy with whom both Saul and David have to reckon although the earlier history would have led us to expect some further account of that overthrow of the Canaanites which Solomon completed (see above, p. 44 sq.). Should it be held that the two peoples were allied against Israel, this must also be borne in mind in those chapters in 1 Sam. where David of Bethlehem and Saul of Benjamin are concerned.

[2] The "valley of Rephaim" is also suggestive for primitive tradition; see Schwally, *Zeit. f. alttest. Wissensch.*, 1898, p. 130. On Joshua xi. 21 sq. and xiii. 3 (which are now Deut.), see Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *Hex.*, ad loc.

[3] Cp. Joshua and Saul against Canaanites and Philistines respectively (see pp 21, 59); the relations of Danites to Amorites (Judges i. 34) and Philistines (Judges xiii sqq.).

[4] vers. 17–21 may have been retained through a misunderstanding of "the hold," and it may have been thought that the defeat in vers. 22–25

The present distinctive narratives between ii. 11 and v deal with warfare before the capture of Jerusalem, but the traditions are of a more developed character, and even record a fight with Benjamites at Gibeon before the district around Jerusalem was taken! The compiler's general position is correct, but the details and character of the conflicts are untrustworthy. On the other hand, the primitive tradition suggests that David encountered the Anakites on his way to Jerusalem, and this is remarkably suggestive since the spies from Kadesh had seen the same mysterious folk, and Caleb had expelled the three "sons of Anak" from Hebron.

Thus we return again to S and the Kadesh traditions. Caleb and the Anakites find their parallel in the primitive tradition of David's men and the giants of Gath. Elsewhere David himself appears in the wilderness of Paran (Kadesh)[1], at Ziklag and at Gath; he enters into relations with sheikhs south of Hebron, and his priest Abiathar bears with him the oracle. It is singular that it is precisely in 2 Sam. v–viii, xxi-xxiv that we have not only the traditions of David's conquests over the primitive populations, but also his dealings with Araunah (*sic*) the Jebusite and with the Gibeonites (with evidence for *another* aspect of his relations to Saul's family). It is here, too, that the ark is triumphantly installed in Jerusalem. To supplement what has already been said[2], it now seems clear that S has a more definite value. The isolated details have a more real connexion, although it is still impossible to determine how much is history and how much later reflection. But it is evident that there is a lack of homogeneity. The ark appears in Num. x. 33 sqq. in a passage which may not be from the same source as vers. 29–32, where *Hobab* is mentioned. Abiathar's name suggests *Jethro*, and 1 Kings ii. 26 sq. (where he is said to have carried the ark before David) may be among the secondary portions of the chapter[3]. It is quite intelligible that one tradition associated the ark with the journey *from* Kadesh, another with David's progress *towards* Jerusalem. But these are quite distinct from the appearance of the ark with Joshua at Shiloh. Caleb the faithful spy and the Caleb of 1 Chron. ii belong to different strata. Caleb, who leaves Kadesh and smites Anakites at Hebron,

happened after the capture of Jerusalem; but in xxi and xxiii the scenes are Gath, Lehi, Adullam and Pas-dammim (cp. 1 Chron. xi. 13).

[1] See p. 8, n. 2.

[2] See above, pp. 124 sq. As for the traditions of connexions with E. Jordan we may notice the names in 2 Sam. xxiii. 34–39 (Zobah, Gad, &c.), and Mesha's remarkable notice of the capture of the אראל דודה; דודה was apparently a local god.

[3] *A. J. S. L.*, p. 175.

and David who fights the giants further north, belong to the same group of tradition, but no historical connexion can be traced between them. The conflicts with the men of Gath have all the air of primitive legend (cp. 2 Sam. xxiii. 9 sq., 18; 1 Chron. xi. 11, 20), but David's relations to Achish (1 Sam. xxvii, xxix) obviously stand upon another footing. The standpoint of S appears to indicate that a certain relationship was felt between the east of the Jordan and the south, although if this explains certain features in David's history it leaves his wars with Moab and Edom difficult. S points to a general movement northwards, whereas David's fight with Amalekites is a contrary tendency, and the hostility of the "enemies of Yahweh" does not belong to the older Kadesh stories. How varied the spirit which animates these diverse though not unconnected traditions needs no further illustration, and when we perceive how old traditions could be dismembered and supplanted, and when we recognize the scantiness of our material, it would be imprudent at present to attempt to recover all the half-obliterated steps.

It is clear that even the earlier traditions associated with David are not homogeneous, and this will probably be intelligible when we recollect that we have to deal not only with the individual traditions of the founder of a dynasty, but also with the growth of a tribe (Judah), and with the spread of a movement which ultimately (at all events) was associated with David's name. Some important conclusions can, however, be drawn. Judaean history starts with David, and there is little doubt that Saul's traditions continued to develop favourably before the rise of the tendency to belittle his character. The part played by Samuel in 1 Sam. ix does not appear to belong to the oldest account of Saul, and the figure of the seer in ch. xii, although considerably idealized, is not hostile to the king. Ch. xv, on the other hand, which has been used to describe his rejection, is a relatively late tradition: the idea of vengeance upon Amalek is secondary [1]. This chapter prepares the way for the introduction of David, which, in its turn, depends upon xiv. 52 [2]. Thenceforth the

[1] That Samuel, perhaps originally of southern origin (cp. p. 98), should be friendly to an Israelite king agrees with the interest which Saul takes in the Kenites, and finds a parallel in Jehu and the Rechabites (see p. 29). xiii. 7 *b*–15 describes the rejection of Saul immediately after his election; perhaps a writer who was familiar with the final review of the history of the northern kingdom (2 Kings xvii) is responsible for the insertion.

[2] "There was sore war against the Philistines all the days of Saul, and when Saul saw any mighty man or any valiant man he took him to him."

traditions represent incessant conflicts with Philistines, but only where the history of David is involved. It is probable that the defeat of Gilboa is no exception, since considerable difficulty is occasioned by the supposition that the *Philistines* marched northwards from their five cities and attacked Saul from Aphek. If the original tradition knew of some enemy whose home lay in the north the situation is explicable, and the motive which has influenced the redaction will be readily perceived if we may conclude that the tradition of Saul's deliverance of Israel from the Philistine yoke was supplanted by that of David's achievement [1].

Further, with this battle at Gilboa the present account of David's war with Amalek is involved, since his journey to Aphek with Achish of Gath allowed the Amalekites to take revenge for the raids from which they had suffered. The various difficulties in the narratives have already been noticed. David had taken refuge with Achish at Gath (1 Sam. xxvii. 1 sqq.), and accompanied the "Philistines" on the march (xxix, see p. 30), but Ziklag was also his residence (xxvii. 6), and thither he returned to find it burned (xxx). The relation between the southern tribes is obscure, since David's customary expeditions were against Geshurites, Girzites (?), and Amalek[2], but the specific occasion in xxvii. 10 is against the south of Judah, Jerahmeelites, and Kenites, and Achish's remark implies that this would concern Israel. The Amalekites actually retaliate upon Ziklag and the negeb of Cherethites and Caleb, although David

[1] On the general difficulties, see further p. 30. The use of the bow in 1 Sam. xxxi. 3 is more suggestive of 1 Kings xxii. 34 than of 1 Sam. xvii. 5–7; the mention of Aphek (cp. iv. 1) is also interesting. The general situation, central Palestine (and no doubt a part of east of the Jordan) *versus* the north is reminiscent of Judges v. The lament from the Book of Jashar refers to the Philistines in 2 Sam. i. 20 (cp. Jer. xlvi. 14, Mic. i. 10), but this is scarcely decisive against the above view *unless* old poems were free from that revision which is constantly allowed in other writings. Klostermann's ingenious emendation in vv. 18 sq. brings in a reference to Judah, but the poem is written from the northern standpoint (cp. above, p. 131, n. 2). The Davidic authorship need scarcely be discussed. The one question is: *When* could David have uttered it? On the other hand, the poem proves how very little of the old traditions of Saul have been preserved. Its allusions to the personal characteristics of Saul and Jonathan, their mutual love, their bravery, the wealth which their conquests had brought to the people, are sufficient (for consistent criticism) to decide how far the Saul of old tradition has suffered from the later tendency to subordinate his figure to that of David.

[2] In xxvii. 8 the LXX suggests that the tenses should be frequentative as in ver. 9 (see Budde).

sends the recaptured spoil to clans (xxx. 26 sqq.), with whom, as king of Hebron, he became closely connected. But it is recognized that 2 Sam. i. 6–10, 13 sqq., which contain a variant tradition of Saul's death, are later insertions — singularly enough the leading figure is an Amalekite. The opening details of that chapter are ambiguous, and appear to ignore 1 Sam. xxx, and the time occupied by David's pursuit of the raiders. Hence it is probable that the parenthetical "and David had returned from smiting Amalek[1]" is a gloss, and the account of the Amalekite war one of the latest insertions in the present traditions. It may well be based upon some conflict between Judah and the south—common enough in later times—and might owe its insertion to the fact that Saul was credited with a defeat of the same people[2].

It is probable that at some stage 1 Sam. xxiii. 1–14 was followed immediately by xxviii. 1 (see p. 7). Here we may perhaps recognize traces of a tradition that David advanced from Keilah to Gath. In their present form the narratives represent an attack upon the "Philistines" of Keilah, which scarcely agrees with his relations with Achish, and the latter, the king of Gath, can hardly have anything in common with the indigenous giants whom we meet in 2 Sam. xxi and xxiii. It is possible that the "Philistines" did not enter into the original traditions here, but it is obvious that at some period in the literary growth this ethnic could be historically correct. The evidence is much too scanty for the further discussion of the problem of the "Philistines" in these chapters, and if they are due in part to post-Deut. redaction, it is quite possible that dealings with the more tangible people of the eighth or seventh century B. C. have influenced the traditions[3].

[1] יַשְׁבֵ֫ (2 Sam. i. 1). Perfects with weak ו are generally as suggestive as the unexpected introduction of frequentatives.

[2] Since it now appears that Davidic traditions were *inserted* at a period when those of Saul had been considerably developed, it is not unlikely that of the two parallels, 1 Sam. xiv. 47–51 and 2 Sam. viii, the former is the more original (see p. 106 sq., above).

[3] The conjecture that one tradition traced David's steps through Keilah and Gath to Jerusalem recalls 2 Sam. xv. 18 sqq., where Ittai and his men are said to have come from Gath. The encounter with the "Philistines," in which David became known to Saul, may be based upon an old story of conflict with Anakites; Ephes-dammim (xvii. 1) is actually the scene in 1 Chron. xi. 13 (2 Sam. xxiii. 9), and it is noteworthy that the enemy are pursued northwards (ver. 52). It may be added that even in a chapter so relatively old as 1 Sam. xxv the essential purpose lies in the words of Abigail, where, as Reuss has observed :

The group of older Davidic traditions in 2 Sam. v–viii, xxi–xxiv, consists of fragments evidently from various sources now in a redacted form. They are distinctly reminiscent of the Judaean chronicles in Kings, and apparently it is to the same hand that we owe the similar miscellaneous notices of Solomon's life[1]. At all events, it is noteworthy that whilst 2 Sam. viii relates David's great conquests, 1 Kings v. 3, consistently enough, implies that his reign was one of incessant warfare. These annals of a great and glorious kingdom under the victorious David and the wise and bountiful Solomon are supplemented by more detailed narratives of a somewhat popular character (but see 2 Sam. x, xii. 26 sqq.). The provoking allusions to significant events summarily mentioned in the chronicles of Judah and Israel are rarely elaborated, although popular tradition was surely able to supplement such scanty notices as 2 Kings viii. 20 sqq., xii. 20 sq., xiv. 19, xviii. 8, xxi. 23 sq., &c. But fortunately a number of traditions of David's life are preserved. The more primitive representation underlying 2 Sam. v–viii, xxi–xxiv shows that many of these cannot be accepted as trustworthy, they are of greater value for other topics than the history of the tenth cent. B. C. We have masterpieces of descriptive writing, but, as in the account of Absalom's revolt, the very conciseness points not to the contemporary, who is apt to lose himself in a maze of detail, but to a later age when tradition was crystallized. Considered as a literary or historical unit after or even in connexion with the above group, chs. ix–xx, present the gravest problems[2]. It is probably safer to regard them as an independent growth which had existed separately and were inserted in their present position with renewed revision and redaction. As they now stand, they imply that close relations had always subsisted between David and Saul (or Israel), and they give expression to the theory that David (the Judaean king) delivered Israel from the Philistines. Their true value lies in the fact that they enable us to understand the relations of Judah with its immediate neighbours, internal troubles among the Judaean clans, rivalry with Israel, and even intrigues with

"nicht das Weib der Wüste, das von der Politik nichts weiss und von der Zukunft Davids nichts wissen kann, spricht hier, sondern der geschichtskundige Redaktor."

[1] e.g. 1 Kings ii. 10–12, iii. 3, iv sq., ix. For the literary criticism it is instructive to observe that iv, v, ix were originally contiguous (proved by the transposition of elements, and by comparison with the LXX), but have been *severed* by the account of the building of the temple, the insertion of which has been accompanied with appropriate revision. On the possibility that there was a history of the temple upon which compilers could draw see above, p. 108, n. 1.

[2] On their character see Luther in Meyer, *op. cit.*, 184 sq., 187, 195 sq.

Israelite military officials. But there is no continuity of history, and, although we can perceive the *intention* of the compilers, it is extremely difficult to trace the stages in the growth[1].

This difficulty makes itself felt again when we leave the representation of Solomon, the great and powerful monarch, and turn to other traditions. The account of the troubles which threatened his kingdom (1 Kings xi. 14 sqq.) throws another light upon his reign, although it is obvious that it is the required introduction to the subsequent history. There are passages in 1 Kings i, ii which emphasize the important dissension in Judah before Solomon came to the throne. It would be difficult to imagine a more serious conflict of interests, its consequences were far-reaching; yet, when the compiler leaves this source and employs another, we are in another atmosphere. We gather from 1 Kings iv that the one district which

[1] The literary theory that ix–xx had been *omitted* by the Deut. redactor and subsequently restored in their present form is not proved by the repetition of the list of officers (L, viii. 15–18) at the close of xx (L^1, vers. 23–26), as Budde and Kennedy argue. A compiler after inserting a passage will repeat a portion of the original either through error or in order to pick up the thread. But where is the thread continued, and why should L and L^1 be variant forms of the official list? L^1 perhaps presupposes some fuller record which has been ignored because it covered much the same ground as v–viii; we appear to meet with similar material in 1 Kings ii (p. 138, n. 1), and in this chapter the LXX has a list of Solomon's officials which differs from that in 1 Kings iv. In fact, the whole literary problem is extremely complex, since the allusions in 1 Kings ii. 5, 32 connect the murder of Abner and Amasa. This, by itself, suggests that both were in the same context. At present the former (ii. 12–iii) precedes L and the latter L^1, and on historical grounds Absalom's revolt precedes David's great wars (in viii). Moreover, when the reconciliation is followed by the meeting with Judah and Israel at Gilgal (xix. 15, 40, the repetitions are significant), it is impossible to ignore the prominence of Gilgal in the traditions of Saul, and the extent to which those of David have been modelled upon them. Hence the conjecture that some "renewal of the kingdom" might have been expected in xix may not appear so incomprehensible as Budde declares (cp. 1 Sam. xi. 14 sq., and *A. J. S. L.*, 169). It is obvious that we have to deal with two or more stages of redaction, with extremely little material upon which to work. The attempt may be made (as in *A. J. S. L.* and Sect. I) to gain some consecutive history out of these intricate narratives, and if their complexity will be recognized the solution of the literary problems may be safely left to more competent hands than the present writer's. The general impression which is gained suggests that the key is to be found in a closer study of Kings and in the special investigation of the "chronicles of the kings of Judah."

had resisted his accession was exempt from the necessity of providing for his maintenance, and if Judaean territory is included in ver. 9 sq., it is evident that the southern portion finds no place in the administration[1].

Accordingly, when one proceeds to look beneath the surface of the early pre-monarchical period, and the remarkably abundant traditions of the remote age of Saul and David, it is impossible to ignore the intricacy of the problems. There is, indeed, a superficial unity in those narratives which have been invariably regarded as old, but the lack of homogeneity is patent. We are compelled to recognize that (*a*) there was one Saul, worthy of the panegyric in 2 Sam. i, the conqueror (1 Sam. xiv. 47–51), the authentic traditions of whose life are sadly few, and (*b*) there was the enemy of David, a petty and local character subordinated to the figure of the Judaean, and constantly troubled by Philistine inroads. Again, there is (*c*) the David of Bethlehem who, from the first, was closely associated with Saul, Benjamin, and Israel, who delivered Israel from the Philistines, whose history is characterized by his chivalry and love towards Saul, Jonathan, and their descendants; and, there is (*d*) the David of Judaean traditions, whose achievements are preserved in 2 Sam. v–viii, xxi–xxiv, and in old Judaean narratives elsewhere, whose steps to the throne are through enterprise and war, a shadowy figure whose victories over prehistoric giants cleared the way for the foundation of the kingdom of Judah. It is evident that *b* and *c* are closely allied; they represent the prevailing view which the last compilers successfully imprinted upon their readers, but if it is recognized that *a* and *d* are earlier than *b* and *c*, this series of notes will have achieved its purpose.

But this is only the first stage in the criticism of this period. Although *a* and *d*, *b* and *c* appear to belong to distinct sources, it is evident that each has had a literary history, whether in its separate form or in the course of combination. The former contains undoubtedly late elements, the latter in its turn preserves some old traditions. It is obvious that *a* and, to a greater degree, *d* bring us into the midst of problems of the greatest significance. It had been noticed that *b* and *c* ignore the Jebusite or non-Israelite district, whereas it now appears from *d* that the earliest traditions

[1] The officials in iv. 9 sqq. are scarcely Judaean. They may be foreigners (Gray, *Heb. Proper Names*, pp. 73 sq.), but this is singular in view of other traditions of the king. The possible connexion between Ben-deker (ver. 9) and Bidkar (the officer of Ahab and Jehu) is interesting, because the list really appears to represent a division of the kingdom from the standpoint of the north.

ascribed to David the conquest of an alien area of much greater extent. This is intelligible when we perceive that the older traditions of Joshua, from their standpoint, recognize as hostile not merely Gibeon, but a *pentad* of cities, comprising Jerusalem, Jarmuth, Lachish, Eglon, and even Hebron (Joshua x). It is manifest that the study of the early period not only reveals the interest taken in the foundation of the monarchy by late writers, but throws another light upon the Israelites and their tribal divisions.

IX. Conclusion.

The clue to the study of the traditions of David and to the criticism of the period lies in the figure of Saul, the older accounts of whose work are to be found in 1 Sam. xiv. 47–51, and underlie those narratives which agree with the situation embodied in the redactor's notices (see above). Saul met his end in a defeat from the north, and whatever success Ishbaal achieved was doubtless through the help of Abner, the captain of his army (2 Sam. ii. 8–10*a*). Here, unfortunately, the independent annals are broken off[1]. We expect some prelude to the statement that Saul took "the kingdom over Israel" (1 Sam. xiv. 47), and, on literary grounds, one is induced to associate with the annals: vii. 13–17 (the close of Samuel's career) and the foundation of the monarchy. The latter is a composite narrative, and this, with the complicated character of the present introduction to the oppression of the Philistines and Ammonites (Judges x. 6 sqq.), serves to illustrate the fact that literary intricacy and repeated development of tradition go hand in hand. Indeed, the literary features are so complex that one hesitates to attempt to trace the growth of the traditions. At all events, Judges x appears to have been connected originally with Saul's overthrow of the Philistines; next, Samuel the seer plays a part in the rise of Saul; and, finally, the victory is ascribed to Samuel himself. We may assume that the hand responsible for chap. vii associated Saul's rise with the Ammonite oppression[2]. The main difficulty, however, lies in the criticism of the Deuteronomic redaction, which is known to have been a continued process, and not a single example of literary activity. Already, it is freely recognized that Judges xvii–xxi are due to post-Deut. insertion, but the close connexion as regards subject-matter between this Appendix and 1 Sam. i sqq. cannot be set aside. It is probable that the abruptly introduced

[1] Their general resemblance to the Israelite chronicles in Kings has already been noticed. These scarcely began with Jeroboam, since David and Solomon would naturally be regarded as kings of Israel, and ought to have found a place in them. With Ishbaal's short reign we may compare Nadab, Elah, and Ahaziah, all weak successors of powerful monarchs, and with the prominence of his captain Abner it is interesting to observe the successful intrigues of other military officials. A famous example is Omri, but still more famous is the case of the commander Jehu, who, if properly a son of the *Judaean* Jehoshaphat (2 Kings ix. 2, 14), was a kinsman of Jehoram.

[2] One or two features suggest that even at this later stage the Introduction was followed by 1 Sam. vii. See p. 25.

story of Eli at Shiloh, with the account of Samuel's youth, is intended to form an introduction to the seer's prominence in chap. vii sqq., in particular to the great victory with which he was credited. The insertion of explanatory or introductory material is always intelligible, and with the traditions encircling Shiloh we may associate the subsequent appearance of the priests at Nob. The fall of the sanctuary leads to the settlement near the capital. Here, at all events, it is clear that the presence of Israelite priests a few miles north of Jerusalem, the Jebusite city, the ferocity of Saul (now a mere local king at Gibeah, xxii. 6), and his attitude towards both David and Jonathan are sufficient to indicate the relative lateness of xxi. 1-9, xxii. 6-23, and of the series to which these passages belong. Incidentally, the fact that the priests are slain by an *Edomite*, in a narrative which is late in its present form, is extremely suggestive[1].

It is very embarrassing to find that the tendency to subordinate the older written traditions of Saul to those of David is late—apparently post-Deuteronomic—since it is evident that the former, with all their scantiness, must represent the fruit of centuries. Saul's defeat of the Philistines is not only overshadowed by Samuel's victory (which is unhistorical and clearly late), but the fragmentary remains of his achievement now give the greater prominence to Jonathan, whose romantic attachment to David stands in marked contrast to the father's hatred (see above, p. 22). Consequently, it is not easyto perceive the relation between 1 Sam. vii, which removes all fear of the Philistines, and the view in 2 Sam. iii. 18, xix. 9, that it was David who freed Israel from the oppression, unless we assume that this view, together with the redaction which accompanies it, is secondary[2]. There are difficulties of a more serious character. The account of Saul's deliverance of Jabesh-Gilead looks like one of the stories of the "judges," as though the last judge became the first king. It suggests that in early tradition Saul's centre of influence was to be found beyond

[1] Whilst Judges xvii sq. contain traditions closely allied to those of Eli and the ark (see p. 97 sq.), xix-xxi (which are inimical to Saul's traditional tribe) are probably intended to pave the way for the new prominence of Benjamin (see p. 54 sq.). The present stories in iv sq. may be based upon good traditions of Shiloh (note that the "Philistines" encamp in Aphek), but must be viewed from a much later standpoint. The account of the installation of the ark in 2 Sam. vi is now connected with 1 Sam. vii. 1, but this is obviously contradicted by 1 Kings ii. 26; in the tradition which underlies 2 Sam. vi it is of course possible that Obed-edom the Gittite was not a Philistine but one of David's men who came from Gath (cp. p. 137, n. 3).

[2] See above, pp. 135 sqq., on 1 Sam. xiv. 52, xxxi, &c.

the Jordan[1]—at all events, it is clear that it was not originally in Benjamin. Now, the writer in vii. 14, after describing the defeat of the *Philistines* in the south, states that there was peace between Israel and the *Amorites*! The change is suggestive in view of analogous fluctuation elsewhere, and one can scarcely determine *what* tradition and *whose* tradition has been used to enhance the greatness of Samuel. It is also noteworthy that of the two narratives which narrate Saul's prowess in Palestine—and both have been used to describe his sin—that in xiv finds a parallel in the account of Joshua's overthrow of the southern Canaanites. The various points of contact between Saul and Joshua are perplexing[2], and it is difficult to understand them unless there was a tendency to ascribe to Saul wars against a people of the south who were *not* Philistines. A transference of tradition (e.g. from Joshua to Saul) is intelligible, but it is also possible that the features are not due to intentional introduction, but are a survival. Moreover, it is not easy to understand why a writer should have introduced the "Amorites" into vii. 14, whereas a tradition of conflicts between them and Israel could well have been redacted in order to introduce the "Philistines[3]."

Now, if we look back to the traditions relegated to the earliest periods, we meet with a twofold representation of the origin of Israel: the entrance of the ancestors from the north; the invasion of the Israelites themselves from the south. The general trend of the former is to suggest that a footing was gained in Palestine[4], whereas in the Exodus we have the story of a land to be conquered in its entirety, previous intercourse between the ancestors and the inhabitants being ignored. Both Abraham and Jacob enter the land (the latter from Gilead), pass to Shechem, and thence proceed south to Bethel. Jacob himself takes Shechem with his sword and bow—central Palestine, it was perhaps thought, was the first to be taken. At a point between Ai[5] and Bethel Lot separates from Abram; and below Bethel, Rachel (a tribe-name?) dies, Benjamin is born, and the compiler (who replaces the older source by P) names the sons of Jacob, and preserves among Edomite lists a brief statement of the separation of Jacob and Esau (Gen. xxxvi. 6–8, cp. xiii. 6).

[1] See p. 59.

[2] See pp. 21 and n. 5, 28, 55, 56, n. 1.

[3] It is hardly necessary to notice that not only are iv sq. and vii derived from different documents, but the geographical situation is different.

[4] Cp. Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 228, 433; Luther, pp. 108 sq. A reference to the Exodus in the patriarchal stories is exceptional (Gen. xv. 12–16).

[5] On Ai see p. 56 sq., and for traditions of fights in its neighbourhood, cp. Judges xx.

Joshua from Gilgal overcomes Canaanite cities in a fight in which the same spot between Ai and Bethel is conspicuous, and his attack upon the southern Canaanites and his dealings with Gibeon find their echo in the achievements of Saul. But whilst Saul, like Joshua, proceeds from Gilgal, there is the possibility that both were more closely associated with central Palestine. However, the general movement is (certainly in the case of Abraham and Jacob) from the north and east towards the south, with traditions of conflict and of new tribal relations in districts which are connected with Benjamin and Judah[1].

On the other hand, in the story of Isaac we are in the south; the patriarch enters into a covenant relation with Abimelech and the Philistines[2]. Jacob separates from Esau-Edom and departs for the land east of the Jordan, even as "Hezron," the father of Caleb and Jerahmeel, goes to Gilead[3]. The general tendency is that of S. But, in addition to this, the theory underlying S appears to have influenced the story of Abraham, since the *insertion* of Gen. xii. 10-xiii. 1 places the separation of Lot and Abram *after* the ascent from Egypt[4]. The complete fusion of S and C appears in the twofold move of Jacob (i. e. Israel)[5], and the story of Joseph succeeds in linking together successfully the entrance of the ancestors and the subsequent invasion of the Israelites. The story of Joseph, however, has very distinctive features of its own, and appears to be an independent cycle which has been used to form a connecting link[6]. Similarly, the invasion in the book of Joshua has no original connexion with the Kadesh cycle, and Saul and David, the two prominent heroes of C and S, are not brought together until the independent traditions of Saul have undergone considerable growth.

[1] See further, pp. 54-58.

[2] One is reminded of David and Achish, and the latter is actually called Abimelech in Ps. xxxiv, title. The name Achish (LXX *αγχους*, i. e. אכוש) has been identified with that of Ikausu king of Ekron (seventh century).

[3] 1 Chron. ii. 21 sq.; according to the northern standpoint Machir is half-Aramaean (vii. 14). In Num. xxxii. 40 sq. (where Machir is the son of Manasseh) fusion of tradition has apparently already taken place.

[4] If (as seems probable) this is due to method one may perhaps notice the expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael followed by the journey of Eliezer to Nahor's city. Even Jacob's bones are removed in peace to Abel-Mizraim beyond the Jordan (Gen. l. 11), but for obvious reasons his sons return again to Egypt.

[5] Hence the separation from Esau and the visit to Bethel are each mentioned twice.

[6] See Luther in Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 142 sqq.

Accordingly, we are led to conclude that C has preserved the recollection of an entrance from the north which has been fused with that of an invasion from the south. The former is the kind of tradition which could have been retained orally for centuries. The old stories of Britain tell of the entrance of a hero (Brutus) who filled the land with his descendants. C, in turn, has heroic figures who, however, seem to have been of local origin – it is intelligible that an immigration would be associated with different names in different districts. Jacob is primarily the conqueror of Shechem[1]; Joshua belongs rather to the south of Ephraim; Saul's origin is conjectural. No historical connexion can be traced between the three: Saul, Joshua, and Jacob; each takes his place in biblical history; each becomes ever less tangible; the development is greater, and the fusion with S more pronounced. So, also, there is no historical bond between Caleb and David; Judaean history commences with David, and his traditions make him contemporary with the first king of Israel. The first king entered Judah by conquest, and his traditions are partly individual or personal, and partly tribal or national. The same appears to be true also of Saul. Although the latter appears before us as a tangible figure, his traditions are replete with grave problems, and one cannot ignore the possibility that there may have been a tendency (as in other fields) to historicize heroic legends. The problem is that of the hero who now stands at the head of the Israelite kingdom.

The traditions of a Caleb or of a David with movements against an alien people are scarcely those of historical figures. It is no mere belt of cities between Judah and Ephraim which is recognized, but an entire hostile district (p. 141). There is no evidence for the assumption that Joshua's defeat of the southern Canaanites was followed by a loss of territory, or that David encountered Israelites at Adullam, Timnah, or Chezib (Gen. xxxviii). On the other hand, it is clear from the literary analysis that the oldest portions of Joshua x recognize as hostile Jerusalem, Hebron, Jarmuth, Lachish, and Eglon[2], whereas it is ix. 17, a *post-exilic* source, which supports the theory of a thin strip of non-Israelite territory. The latter

[1] There was doubtless some reason for the account of the Canaanite war ascribed to him in Jubilees xxxiv. (It is very instructive to observe the growth between JE, P, and Jubilees—still more suggestive is the chronological relation between the three.)

[2] This pentad possibly accounts for the tradition of the five Philistine cities. C's standpoint in Joshua ix sq. seems to reappear in 1 Chron. vii. 21 where there are feuds between Ephraim and the men of Gath "born in the land."

recurs in passages embedded in P (Joshua xv. 63, cp. xvi. 10), is illustrated by Judges xix. 10, 12, and finds support in Judges i. Now, it has been seen that C and S bring us into the midst of Palestinian history without throwing any light upon the tribes of Israel; they give us the invasion of Palestine and the movement from the south, but do not solve the problem of the *Israelite* invasion. On the one hand, it is held that Joshua gives an exaggerated account of the settlement to which the details in Judges i are to be preferred. It is agreed, also, that not all the tribes took part in the invasion under Joshua, and various reconstructions have been proposed, with the help of Judges i and the tribal details elsewhere. But to maintain Judges i it is usual to reject even the oldest traditions of Joshua, and to present a reconstruction it is necessary to go behind Judges i[1]. On the other hand, the stories of Joshua appear to be those of conquest and extension from the standpoint of C[2], whereas Judges i gives a representation subsequent to the fusion of S and C. It is really questionable whether the two ought to be compared. In fact, thetreatment of Judah, Simeon, and Caleb in Judg. i scarcely inspires confidence, and since the fusion of S and C is relatively late, it becomes somewhat remarkable that the theory of the belt of cities is found in P itself, embedded in P, or in passages (viz. Judges i, xix) which owe their presence to post-Deuteronomic redaction[3].

The fusion of the two movements in C and S is found to underlie the patriarchal narratives in their present form (p. 145). These, as also the tribal schemes, can scarcely claim the antiquity invariably ascribed to them. It is customary to assume that the recollection of *details* of invasion and settlement, and of early tribal history, was faithfully preserved for some centuries in oral tradition. The experience of history forbids over-confidence. Tribal relations and the like are apt to vary, and although a complete tribal scheme is conceivable for the years when Judah and Israel were united under David and Solomon, the administration of the latter in 1 Kings iv is not on

[1] Judges i. 4, 8–10, 18 are recognized as additions; on vers. 5–7 see Meyer, pp. 438 sq.

[2] It is now improbable that Joshua's victories are based upon those of Saul and David (so above, pp. 31, 41); Joshua and Saul are independent figures, and the former belongs to a body of tradition originally quite distinct from that of David.

[3] It is difficult to explain the origin of the non-Israelite belts of cities in the south and north. Since Shechem itself is not mentioned, they may possibly represent the view in Ephraim and Manasseh after the entrance from the east, and before the fusion with tribes in the south and north (cp. p. 96).

the lines of the tribal divisions, and excludes the south of Palestine. Moreover, on ordinary grounds, it is hardly probable that early divisions were maintained throughout the monarchy, when it is only in the latest literature that the schemes are made to work. The few historical allusions in the patriarchal narratives are inconclusive, and this is not unnatural, since popular tradition will often ignore the events which interest historical research[1]. Although many of the internal data (e.g. life, language) are not decisive, the highly developed form and lofty tone of the traditions are very significant. Those who maintain the older view, that J, E, and P in the Pentateuch cannot extend over a great number of centuries, are justified by the close connexion which subsists between the sources. It is well known that in an early stage of literary criticism, P was rent in two: the legal elements were recognized to be post-exilic, but the narrative portions were retained at the beginning together with J and E. But the anomaly of "separating its members by an interval of half a millenium" was intolerable, and the present Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis, which makes both post-exilic, has gained yearly in force. Whilst literary criticism has rejected the older assumption of the passive existence of laws for ages before they had practical influence, historical criticism, in its turn, perhaps will not be prepared to admit the passive existence of historical conditions and situations when JE and P are severed, as at present, by a considerable chronological gap. P has undoubtedly much that is artificial, and his conception of the past is in many respects untrustworthy, but there is something incredible in the critical view that the historical foundation for his ideas is removed from his own age by centuries of warfare, revolt, immigration, and a multitude of disturbing elements[2].

[1] Cp. Langlois and Seignobos, *Introd. to Study of History*, p. 181, note.

[2] Whatever be the accepted date of Gen. xxxviii, is it plausible to suppose that it preserves Judaean tribal-history of pre-Davidic ages when David himself has conflicts with the "giants" in the same district? Its point lies in the strengthening of Judah by the clans Perez and Zerah — which are exilic. The story is of purely local interest, and although there are no primitive traits of chronological value, the penalty of burning is unusual (Lev. xx. 14, xxi. 9), and associates itself with Jubilees xx. 4 rather than with assumed earlier usage. The *Kedêshôth*, too, do not become disreputable until later times, Moreover, whatever be the date of Gen. xxxiv, has this, also, preserved the history of the earliest period? It is strange that P should be content to resurrect so antiquated a fragment unless the tradition were a living one, and if it were still fresh, the intricate racial history of Central Palestine must be taken into consideration (see p. 120, foot).

Since one theory cannot be refuted by another, it is unnecessary to consider those reconstructions of the earlier history of Israel which admittedly rest upon tribal and genealogical data (cp. p. 102). The entire question is one of perspective. By approaching the evidence from another standpoint, we have come upon two great bodies of tradition neither of which is "Israelite" in the *accepted* sense of the term. It has been found that the distinctive feature of S is the movement from the south into Palestine. The account of the journey from Kadesh has been drastically treated in order to adapt it to the traditions of an invasion from the east (ultimately from the north). This suggests the preponderating influence of central Palestine. The same is apparent when all the tribes enter from across the Jordan; when all are grouped together as "sons" of Aramean wives, and when Jacob brings his family from an Aramean locality. So far from Judah and Israel being the parallel but rival names of the monarchy, Jacob becomes the father of Judaeans and Israelites, of Levites and laymen alike. If confidence is to be placed in the tribal schemes, one might be tempted to suppose that Joseph tribes entered and spread themselves over the Leah tribes[1], and that the invasion of C was superimposed upon that of S. But, when the entire evidence is viewed more comprehensively, it is evident that such an explanation is insufficient. The literary evidence and the arrangement of the material suggest that the traditions of Central Palestine go back further; its history is the older. The traditions of its first king have been considerably developed before the history of Judah begins, and whatever the independent traditions of Judah may have been, some time has elapsed before the figure of David gains ascendancy. It appears that there was a specific redaction of narratives of Judaean origin for the purpose of introducing the north (Israel). At the same time, a number of traditions cluster around Benjamin and North Judah; and it is fairly obvious that they are of local origin. Although local traditions are naturally found everywhere, it is not mere chance alone which has preserved them in the O. T. The northern tribes would have their own cycles; but, lying outside the interest of compilers, they were ignored. It is intelligible that David's renown would explain the presence of our stories, but great figures are ubiquitous in legend, and their traditions appear in many places and in many shapes. Thus, we require some explanation of the insertion of traditions which represent a late tendency, appear to be due to post-Deuteronomic redaction, and have the effect of making David's figure finally supreme over Judah and Israel.

[1] Cp. p. 95 sq.

With S we may associate the Levites. They appear to have regarded themselves of southern origin, a tradition which could be shared by all members of the caste whether justifiable or not. We have to picture them scattered throughout Palestine and east of the Jordan, retaining some recollection of the nomadic district whence they had come, absorbing the thought and traditions of those in whose midst they settled. Thus, as Levites, they are traced back to Levi a son of Jacob, and appear *in pari passu* with Judah, Simeon, Dan, and the rest. Ultimately, they are congregated around Jerusalem, and David the first king of Judah is looked upon as the organizer of their divisions. In Judah and the Levites it is not impossible that an explanation may be found which will account for the standpoint of S, and for some of its literary features. It is evident that whatever literature existed in ancient Israel, biblical criticism must start with the material which has been handed down, and the form in which it finally appeared. Everything points to continued redaction and to an abundance of literary material in earlier times. It is not inconceivable that the Levites had a hand in shaping old traditions[1], and we cannot forget that it is in the district around Jerusalem that we are to look for the families of the scribes who are associated partly with Kenites and partly with other clans whose traditions were essentially those of S. The final supremacy of Judah and the prominence of Jerusalem as the religious centre of Judaism are historical facts, and one is tempted to connect with them the final supremacy of Judaean traditions over those of non-Judaean origin. Also, the ultimate appearance of Levites around Jerusalem may possibly explain the late introduction of local stories[2].

But it is not proposed to lay any weight upon such conjectures, since the literary and historical problems take us into post-Davidic periods during and after the monarchy. Where the O. T. is concerned criticism cannot confine itself either to any one specified period or to any series of contiguous narratives which prove to have originated at different periods. On the other hand, bodies of documents may be handled independently and analogous conclusions may result; and when the investigation is distributed over a fairly large field, results which are concurrent gain in force. In biblical study the "indestructibility of matter" is a truism. Criticism does not destroy material; it changes the prospect and view-point. That which is

[1] See Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 83 sqq.

[2] Another interesting literary feature is the final separation of the book of Joshua (the *one* book which fuses the invasions of S and C) from the books which precede.

rejected as genuine history may reappear with truer value as a human document, and when a narrative which is unhistorical in one context is found to illuminate or illustrate a later period its value becomes immensely enhanced. Now, not a few indications have been observed which take one far away from the remote age to which the narratives are relegated to periods where the history becomes more real, and where it would be a distinct gain to be able to supplement the relatively scanty records by some insight into contemporary life[1]. However, it would have been premature to attempt definite reconstructions before the entire trend of biblical history had been passed under review or to frame hypotheses of S before the fortunes of Judah had been handled. It is obvious that the criticism of the old traditions of Saul and David will ultimately determine the subsequent vicissitudes of Israel and Judah, and the questions which have been raised are of fundamental importance for the written records of the earlier periods of Palestine. Palestine itself is naturally a unit and, from the independent standpoint of C, Judah and Jerusalem essentially formed part of the whole[2]. The separation of Central Palestine from the south (and *not* the reverse) is a problem in itself. The severance is not a natural one, the line of demarcation more artificial than real. Additional obscurity is caused by the political position of Benjamin, a tribe whose origin is apparently not pre-Davidic. With it is involved the question of Jerusalem; would not the possession of it be the aim of the north? And if S has the traditions of an historical invasion, would the movement stop with the capture of Jerusalem and the district? It is quite intelligible that Rehoboam should have gone to Shechem to be crowned, but why should David be content to make Jerusalem his capital? On the other hand, if we look back upon the past (as in Pentateuchal criticism), and view the career of Judah as a separate kingdom, with Jerusalem as the great religious centre, how much of the records may not be due to reflection? It is precisely in the history of Benjamin and Judah

[1] The richness of the material which has been relegated to the earlier periods stands in such vivid contrast to the scanty records of the divided monarchy that one is apt to gain a false idea of the true proportion of things. Further, one is apt to take for granted the many vital events in later history without reflecting sufficiently upon their significance. It is quite legitimate, at all events, to attempt to picture these brief notices with the help of the more detailed description of analogous incidents elsewhere.

[2] C's traditions point to conquest in the south (e.g. Joshua), and the annals of Saul, with conquests over Edom, Moab, and Amalek, imply that Judah must have been reckoned to Israel.

(where "half a millennium" constantly intervenes between the stages)[1] that one must seek for the key to S, and until the required backgrounds have been recovered it would be undesirable to pursue the investigation further[2]. Central Palestine (Israel proper) was naturally

[1] Cp. e.g. p. 100, n. 1.

[2] The relative abundance of material and the possession of external evidence (from Assyrian sources) make the period from Ahab to Jehu the natural starting-point for another independent examination of the traditions. A few points of contact between the traditions of Samuel and Saul and those of Elijah and Elisha have been mentioned (see above, pp. 29, 35), and a few of the historical parallels have been incidentally hinted at. Now, in 1 Kings xix Elijah flees to Beersheba and Horeb, where he witnesses the theophany in a cave. His zeal for Yahweh and his complaint are rewarded by the promise of a faithful remnant, and his despair at the prevailing Baal-worship is removed by the tidings that another would complete his work. One is reminded of Moses on the mount (cp. Burney, *Kings*, p. 230), where, too, reluctance and complaint, promise and selection are leading motives. Subsequent narratives relate the overthrow of the Tyrian Baal-worship and the fall of Omri's house; the leading spirit in the reform is Jehonadab ben Rechab. The Rechabites were obviously opposed to all luxury, and in favour of a simpler worship of Yahweh, and the association of Rechabites with Kenites, &c.—suggestive enough—is enhanced by the fact that the old laws in Exod. xxxiv are thoroughly imbued with this spirit of simplicity (see p. 124, n. 1). On the one hand, it is certain that there must have been an amount of tradition concerning the great events upon which our narratives are comparatively brief; this prominence of the south at Jehu's rise provokes deeper study (see Meyer, pp. 83 sqq.; Luther, ib., pp. 137 sqq.). On the other hand, in S we have found the selection of the worshippers of Yahweh and the journey of Kenites and allied clans into Palestine—originally from Kadesh, but now in a context which points to Sinai or Horeb. It is possible that a real connexion could be found between these details. But the historical criticism of the period from Ahab to Jehu is extremely intricate. The traditions imply very close relations between Judah and Israel under Omri's dynasty (note the kings Ahaziah and Jehoram), and although *both* reigning families were exterminated Jehu became king only of the north. About half a century later we find that Jerusalem suffered a loss which it is impossible to treat merely as the outcome of a quarrel (2 Kings xiv. 13 sq.). Why the partial destruction of its walls, the removal of hostages, the looting of temple and palace treasure? Why, too, are there contradictory chronological notices after this disaster? Revenge was taken upon Judah, and when one turns to its history for this vital period we no longer meet with the popular sources, but with a new one introduced with marked abruptness, with priests instead of prophets, with a six

associated with the north, whilst the kingdom of Judah was nothing without the tribes and clans which lay to its south, and with this it agrees that Judah and Benjamin as a unit seem to presuppose the movement in S (see p. 58).

The aim in these notes has been to collect the evidence, to interpret it naturally, and to follow out the indications which were afforded. It is obvious that the risk of error increases at each step. It cannot be ignored, therefore, that other interpretations might be found, and more satisfactory explanations might be forthcoming. Nevertheless, consistency demands the application of those principles which are employed in the criticism of the Hexateuch, and to reconcile differences or to obscure difficulties which should prove to be genuine, would be no other than the method of the opponents of biblical criticism themselves. It is manifest that the problems turn, in the first instance, upon our conception of what is meant by the term Israel (cp. pp. 103 sq.). The traditions of the entrance from the east and of a northern home may very well have been the heritage of the national Israel, the northern kingdom, which in its palmy days overshadowed its southern rival if it did not include it. The traditions of Judah were doubtless to a large extent similar to those of Ephraim, but persistent evidence points to the existence of a distinct group of tradition. This may well have been disseminated and developed through that caste who are subsequently known as Levites, and when Judah became the new Israel in a religious sense, traditions of specifically Judaean origin may have been incorporated. At all events, the entrance of the ancestors and the invasion of the Israelites themselves are two distinct factors, and it is now plain perhaps that each must be taken along with other allied traditions, and that they must be consistently criticized throughout. But no finality can be

years' interval before the daughter of Jezebel is slain, and with noteworthy supplementary details in 2 Chron. It would seem that the events between the time when Judah and Israel were closely united and when Amaziah suffered an overwhelming defeat have been obscured. Did Judah break away from Israel some time after Jehu's accession? Finally, it is at this period that the significant features of Yahwism become prominent in the work of Elijah. Consequently, for literary and historical criticism, and for the development of specifically Israelite ideas, the history from Ahab to Jehu is of the first importance, and it is obvious that, although for our early periods with their two distinct standpoints the bulk of narratives in 1 Kings xvii—2 Kings x must be taken into consideration, these must be subjected in their turn to thorough criticism. See, on points of detail, pp. 107, n. 3, 108, n. 1, 112, n. 5, 114, n. 2, 118, n. 1, 131, n. 2, 138, n. 1.

attained so long as those periods, where we are to look for historical light upon the internal conditions, continue to be shrouded in obscurity. Although so much of the evidence is still uncertain, it would be unwise, however, to neglect the more general considerations which bear upon the subject[1]. Consequently, one cannot adopt implicitly the standpoint of those writers who looked back upon the past as the result of one magnificent invasion, as though the history were that of a single stock uninfluenced by its surroundings. One cannot ignore the earlier situations or the trend of internal and external conditions in post-biblical times; these, with the help of recent archaeological research, combine to set the history of Israel in a truer perspective. Palestine was the scene of momentous events long before our historical records, and these pass over much that was of historical importance and fell strictly within their limits. The antiquity of history does not necessarily involve the antiquity of the surviving sources; there were no doubt old traditions to which the writers had access (cp. p. 109), but criticism is confined naturally to those which actually survive.

At successive periods the history of the past was variously apprehended and shaped, and whilst the scientific examination of the historical kernel is a pursuit of absorbing interest for students of history, the religious spirit which influences each successive development remains untouched. Historical criticism applies itself to the traditions, the great truths of which they have become the vehicle are in no wise affected when authorship is denied, contents questioned, or when more drastic changes result. The truths owe their value to their inherent qualities, and are irrespective of technical questions of authorship, contemporaneity or credibility. The lasting value of the Old Testament is entirely independent of its dress. It is true that ancient writers, in accordance with custom, supported their teaching by appeal to authority (pp. 62, 111 sq.), but we of the present day must distinguish between the spirit and the letter, between the motives by which they were actuated and the means they took to make their lesson effective. It is impossible to overlook the freedom with which these writers handled their material, and their methods demand comprehensive and unbiassed investigation, but their aims and the spirit which breathes throughout will always evoke appreciation and sympathy, which will be enhanced as the work of criticism advances, and the more one succeeds in throwing oneself back into the past, the conceptions of the ancient writers of Israel continue to gain increasingly in grandeur and reality.

[1] See above, pp. 102 sqq., and the *Introduction* (also "The Problem of the O.T.," in *J. Q. R.*, July, 1907).

SELECT INDEX OF BIBLICAL PASSAGES DISCUSSED OR ILLUSTRATED.

GEN. iv. 26: 99 n. 2.
xii. 8: 57.
xiii. 6: 58, 144.
xvi. 7: 64 n. 3.
xx: 106 n. 1.
xxi. 15 sqq.: 64 n. 3.
xxi. 22–34: 106 n. 1.
xxvi. 1: 64, 89 n. 3, 110, 124 n. 1.
xxviii. 9: 92 n. 4.
xxviii. 10: 92, 93 n. 2.
xxix sq.: 93.
xxxiii. 19: 126 n. 2.
xxxiv: 89, 148 n. 2.
xxxv. 18 sq.: 58.
xxxvi (names): 39 n. 1, 84 sq.
xxxvi. 6–8: 58, 92, 144.
xxxviii: 148 n. 2.
xlvi. 5: 85 n. 1.
xlviii. 22: 126.
xlix. 5–7: 85.
l. 11: 145 n. 4.
l. 25 sq.: 57 n. 2.

EXOD. iii. 1: 66.
iv. 13–16: 72, 74 n. 1, 78 n. 1, 79 n. 1, 113 n. 2.
v. 3, viii. 27: 65.
xiii. 17: 65, 78, 110, 124 n. 1.
xiii. 19: 57 n. 2, 124 n. 1.
xv. 22–xviii: 64 sqq.
xv. 25 sqq.: 113.
xvi: 65.
xvii: 65 sq.
xvii. 3: 68.
xvii. 8 sqq.: 98 n. 1, 123.
xviii: 66.
xix sqq.: 66.
xix. 22: 79 n. 1.
xx sqq.: 78.
xxiv. 1–11: 71, 77 n. 1.
xxxi. 2: 82.
xxxii–xxxiv: 68, 70.
xxxiii. 7–11: 66 sq.
xxxv–xl: 76.

LEV. viii sq.: 76.
x. 1–5: 68 n. 3, 76 sq.
xxiv: 87.

NUM. x. 12: 68.
x. 29 sqq.–xx: 67 sqq.
x. 29–36: 36, 38, 67, 80, 134.
xi: 65, 68 sq., 113 n. 2.
xii: 72.
xiii sq.: 69.
xiii. 22: 109.
xiv. 24: 38 sq., 91.
xiv. 25: 80, 122.
xiv. 44 sq.: 38, 80 sq., 98 n. 1.
xv: 77 n. 2.
xvi: 68 n. 3, 69, 75, 87.
xvi. 1: 85.
xvi. 37: 77 n. 2.
xx: 65, 69.
xx. 14–22: 80.
xx. 24 sqq.: 74 n. 1.
xxi. 1–3: 38, 80 sqq., 98 n. 1.
xxi. 16–18: 93 n. 2.
xxii–xxiv: 80.
xxv: 87.
xxvii. 3: 75, 92.
xxxii. 39 sqq.: 81 n. 1, 92, 125, 145 n. 3.

DEUT. i. 9–17: 66, 71, 79 n. 1.
i. 36 sq.: 69, 74, 78 n. 1, 113 n. 2.
ii. 4, 9: 80.
viii. 3, 16: 65, 70 n. 1.
ix. 20: 70, 74, 113 n. 2.
ix. 22: 65 sq., 69, 79 n. 1.
x. 1–5: 67.
x. 6 sqq.: 73 n. 2, 74 n. 1, 113 n. 2.
x. 8: 38, 73.
xi. 6: 75.
xxv. 17–19: 79 n. 1.
xxvii. 1–8: 57.
xxxiii. 8–11: 73 sq., 113 n. 2.

JOSHUA ii. 12–14, v. 13–15, vi. 23–5: 56 n. 1.
viii. 9, viii. 30–ix. 2: 57.
ix. 17: 43, 55, 146.
ix. 26 sq.: 28, 43.
x: 21.
x. 6: 59.
x sq.: 126.

xi. 21 sq., xiii. 3 : 133.
xiv. 6–15 : 38 sq., 91.
xv. 14–19 : 38.
xv. 63, xvi. 10 : 147.
xxiv. 28 : 126 n. 4.
xxiv. 32 : 57 n. 2.

Judges i : 39, 43, 96, 126, 146 sq.
i. 16 : 36, 38, 68.
i. 22 sq. ; 56 n. 1.
i. 29, 35 : 43.
i. 34 : 133 n. 3.
ii. 6 : 126 n. 4.
iv. 11 : 36, 88.
vi. 7–10 : 27.
x. 6 sqq. : 24 sqq., 33 sqq., 48 sq., 127 sq.
x. 8–10 : 25 sq., 127.
xi. 16 : 65.
xiii : 34 n. 2.
xiii. 5 : 24 n. 1, 34 n. 2.
xvii–xxi : 24, 36 sq., 40 sq., 54 sq., 142, 143 n. 1.
xvii. 9, xviii. 3, xix. i : 124.
xix. 10–12 : 128 n. 2, 147.
xx. 27 : 90 n. 2, 111.

1 Sam. i. 1 : 52.
ii. 12–17, 22–25 : 34.
ii. 27 sq. : 36, 99.
iv sqq. : 37, 42, 55 n. 2, 90, 127, 143 n. 1.
iv. 9 : 37.
vi. 19–vii. 1 : 128 n. 2.
vii. 13 sq. : 23 n. 3, 142.
vii. 14 : 44, 144.
vii. 16 sq. : 35.
viii : 34 sq.
ix. 1 : 50.
ix. 4 sqq. : 51 sqq.
ix. 15 sq. : 53.
ix. 16 : 21, 23, 26, 127, 132 n. 1.
x. 2 sqq. : 22 sq., 51 sq.
x. 14 : 53 n. 1.
x. 17–25 : 34.
xi : 23.
xi. 8 : 111.
xi. 14 sq. : 139 n. 1.
xii : 34 sq.
xiii sq. : 20 sqq.
xiii. 6 sq. : 25 sq., 128, 132.
xiii. 7–15 : 135 n. 1.
xiv. 18 : 89 n. 3, 111.
xiv. 29, 33 : 56 n. 1.
xiv. 35 : 19.
xiv. 47–51 : 19, 106 sq., 111, 129 n. 3, 137 n. 2, 140, 142.
xiv. 52 : 135 sq.
xv : 28 sq., 34 sq., 135.
xv. 2 : 97.
xv. 4 : 111.
xv. 12 : 29, 52.
xvii. 1–7 : 136 n. 1, 137 n 3.
xvii. 54 : 89 n. 3, 111, 128 n. 2, 151 n. 2.
xix. 18–24 : 7, 35.
xxi. 1–9 : 143.
xxii. 3 sq. : 93.
xxii. 6–23 : 143.
xxiii. 1–14 : 7, 137.
xxiii. 9 : 89 n. 3.
xxv : 7, 10 n. 1, 137 n. 3.
xxv. 1 : 8 n. 2.
xxvii : 6 sq., 136 sq.
xxviii. 3–25 : 34.
xxix : 6, 30.
xxx. 7 : 89 n. 3.
xxx. 25 : 112 n. 3.
xxxi : 136.
xxxi. 7 : 132.

2 Sam. i. 1, 6–10, 13 sqq. : 137.
i. 19 sqq. : 128, 129 n. 3, 136 n. 1.
ii. 1–4 : 133.
ii. 8–10 : 131 sq., 142.
ii. 11 : 11, 131 n. 2.
ii. 12–iv : 131.
iii. 2–5 : 10.
iii. 17 sq. : 131 sq., 143.
iv. 2 sq. : 55.
v–viii : 133 sq., 138.
vi : 37 sqq., 42, 143 n. 1.
vii. 6 sqq. : 90, 125.
viii : 13, 137 n. 2.
viii. 18 : 93.
ix–xx : 2–18, 117 sqq., 138 sq.
ix. 4 : 132.
x. 2 : 4, 12.
xii. 11 : 14 sq.
xv. 7 : 10 n. 2.
xv. 16 : 15.
xv. 18 sqq. : 137 n. 3.
xvi. 6–8, 22 : 15.
xvii. 27 : 4, 14.
xix. 9 : 132, 143.
xx. 3 : 15.
xx. 18 : 41 n. 3.
xx. 26 : 93.
xxi. 1–14 : 14 sqq., 130.
xxi. 1 : 16 n. 2.
xxi. 2 : 28.
xxi. 16 sq. : 11.
xxi–xxiv : 9, 13, 133 sq., 138.

Kings (see p. 152 n. 2 with references).

1 Kings i sq. : 4 sq., 139.
ii. 26 : 89 n. 3, 111, 134, 143 n. 1.

iv. 9 sqq.: 140 n. 1, 147 sq.
v. 3: 138.
vii. 14: 88.
xi. 14 sqq.: 139.
xi. 29 sqq.: 99 n. 1.
xv. 27, xvi. 15 sq.: 45, 60, 131 n. 2.

2 Kings viii. 20 sqq.: 131 n. 2.

1 Chron. ii. 19 sq.: 83.
ii. 21 sqq.: 91, 125, 145 n. 3.
ii. 33: 85.
ii. 43: 84.
ii. 50 sqq.: 40 n. 1.
ii. 55: 29, 91 n. 3, 125.
iv. 9 sq.: 91 n. 3.
iv. 17: 84.
vi: 98 n. 3.
vii. 14: 93 n. 2, 145 n. 3.
vii. 21: 146 n. 2.
vii. 27: 90 n. 1, 98 n. 1.
xi: 3.
xi. 11, 20: 135.
xi. 13: 133 n. 4.
xii: 6, 90, 129.
xxiii. 14: 86 n. 1.
xxiii. 26: 90 n. 1, 125.
xxix. 29: 115.

2 Chron. ii. 14: 88.
viii. 8: 118 n. 1.
xiv. 9 sqq.: 109.
xv. 9: 89.
xx. 35–7: 114 n. 2.
xxi. 10: 118 n. 1.
xxxiv. 6: 89.

Ezra iv. 6–23: 107.

Jer. iii. 16: 42.
vii. 12, xxvi. 6, 9: 42, 127.
xxx. 17 sq.: 91.

Hos. x. 9: 54 n. 2.
xii. 4: 58.

Zech. xii. 12 sq.: 91.

Ps. xxxiv (title): 8, 145 n. 2.

GENERAL INDEX.

Aaron, offence of, 69 sq., 72, 74 n. 1, 113 n. 2.
Aaronites, 86.
Abiathar and the ark, 90, 97, 134.
Abimelech, 8, 145.
Abner, 5, 131, 142; and Amasa, 5, 139 n. 1.
Abraham, Abram, traditions of, 57 sq., 106, 144 sq.
Absalom, 3–17, 117 sq., 138 sq. *See* Geshur, Mahanaim, Sheba.
Achish, 8, 12, 135 sq., 145 n. 2.
Achor, Valley of, 56 n. 1.
Adonijah, 4 sq., 139.
Agag, 28 sq.
Aholiab, 83, 88.
Ai and Bethel, 56 sq., 144.
Amalek, traditions of, in the Exodus, 65 sq., 69 n. 3, 79 n. 1, 123; and Saul, 28 sq., 82 n. 2; and David, 7 sq., 97, 135, 136 sq.
Ammon and Saul, 23 sqq.; and David, 4, 12 sqq. *See* Jabesh-Gilead.
Amorites and Philistines, 43 sq., 144.
Anak, sons of, 44, 133 sq.
Aphek, 30, 136, 143 n. 1.
Ark, problems of, 35 sqq., 42, 55 n. 2; divergent notices, 90 n. 2, 111 n. 1; in southern tradition, 89 sq., 124, 134.

Balaam, narratives, 80 sq.
Bathsheba, 4.
Benjamin, problems of, 29; birth of, 57; population, 58; in traditions of Saul, 50–5, 128, 130, 140, 143 n. 1, 151.
Bethel, 56 sqq., 144 sq.
Bethlehem, 8, 40, 130, 140.
Bezalel, 82 sq.

Caleb, varying traditions, 38 sq.; journey to Judah, 39, 80 sq.; relations with Dan, Levites, &c., 40, 74 n. 1, 78 n. 1, 84 sqq., 88; Calebite group of tradition, 82 sq., 89 sqq.; relation to southern group, 136, 146; bearing upon Judaean history, 100 n. 1.
Calf, golden, 70, 73.
Chronicles, Book of, 67 n. 1, 98 n. 3, 104 n. 1, 114 sq., 118 n. 1.
Chronology, 10 sq., 109, 131 n. 2.
Court history, 2–18; literary criticism, 117 sqq.; historical, 138 sq.

Dan, migration, 36, 40 sqq.; relation to Kadesh and southern traditions, 40 n. 1, 87 sq., 124.
Dathan and Abiram, 75, 87.
David, history of, 2–18; relations with Philistines, 8, 30, 136; Saul, 30, 129 sqq.; capture of Jerusalem, 131 sqq.; other steps, 136 sqq.; conclusions, 140 sq.; Davidic, Judaean, and allied traditions, 124 sq., 134 sq.; their opposition to Israelite traditions, 145 sqq.
Dinah, 89, 148 n. 2.
Doublets, 106 n. 1.

Edom, wars with David, 12 sq., 135; relation to southern clans and Levites, 84 sqq.; to (later) population of Benjamin and Judah, 58; place in Judaean history, 99 n. 2.
Egypt, influence of, 109. *See* Muṣri.
Eleazar, 77 n. 2, 86.
Eli, 34, 37, 39, 97 sqq.
Elijah, 35, 71 n. 3, 152 n. 2.
Elisha, 29, 35, 107.
Exodus, the, 62 sqq.; fusion of different movements, 80 sqq.; bearing upon other traditions, 89 sq., 94 sq., 122 sqq., 134 sq., 144 sq.; independent tradition adjusted to Israelite standpoint, 149 sq.; subsequently presented in a Judaean form, 150, 153.

Gath, 133, 135 sq. *See* Achish.
Genealogies, ethnological, 102 n. 1, 148 sq.; conflate, 50.
Gershom, 86, 88.
Geshur, 3, 9 sq., 93 n. 2, 131 n. 3.
Gibeonites, 43, 55, 133 sq.
Gilboa, 30, 50, 136.
Gilgal, 20 sq., 59, 82, 139 n. 1.

Hezron, 91 sq., 125.
Hiram, 88.
History, biblical, material, 31; distribution, 46 sq.; character, 59 sqq., 62 sq., 104 sq.; betrays later influences, 34; historical theories, 107 sq., 132; historical and literary criticism, 49, 101–21; annals, 129 n. 3, 131, 138 n. 1, 142.
Hobab. *See* Jethro.
Horeb. *See* Sinai.
Hormah, 38, 69 n. 3, 82, 123.

Ichabod, 97.
Isaac, 7 n. 1, 92, 145.
Ishbaal, 11, 16, 131, 142 n. 1.
Israel, problems attached to the ambiguity of the name, 103 sq., 149, 151, 153 sq.; national independent tradition, 131, 140, 142, 144; fusion with Judaean and other traditions, 149. *See* David, Judah, Saul.

Jabesh-Gilead, 22 sq., 50, 55, 59, 131.
Jacob, entrance into Palestine, 56 sq., 59; twofold move, 92 sq.; relation to traditions of Saul and David, 144 sqq.; ancestor of Judah, 149 sq.
Jashar, Book of, cited, 19, 21, 31, 107, 129 n. 3.
Jebusites, in Jerusalem and neighbourhood, 42 sq., 53; bearing upon history of Saul and David, 128 sqq.
Jehu, dynasty of, historical features, 108 n. 1, 152 n. 2; Jehu and Rechabites, 29, 35, 135 n. 1.
Jerahmeel, 8, 85, 136.
Jerusalem, in traditions of Israel, 111, 141, 151 n. 2; of David, 39, 89 sq.; 125, 133 sq. *See* Jebusites.
Jethro, 38, 66 sq., 72 sq., 80, 84, 134. *See* Abiathar.
Joab, 5 sq., 11, 13.
Jonathan, 19 sqq., 143.
Joseph, story of, 145; J. tribes, 56 sqq., 95.
Joshua, in the Exodus, 66, 82, 123 sqq.; points of contact with Saul, 21, 28 sq., 55, 59, 144 sq.; national Israelite figure, 146; of Bethshemesh, 39, 97 sq.
Judah, relation to southern and allied clans, 7, 99 n. 2, 100 n. 1, 134 sqq.; tradition distinct from Israelite, 140. *See* David, Israel, Saul.
"Judges," the, position between books of Joshua and Samuel, 126; possible inclusion of Saul, 23 sqq.

Kadesh, traditions of, 8, 38, 65–81, 87, 97, 122 sq., 134.
Keilah, 7, 137.
Kenites and Saul, 29, 135 n. 1; migration, 36, 39, 81; relation to other clans, 40 n. 1, 84 sq., 88, 134, 152 n. 2.
Kibroth-hattaavah, 68 sq.
Korah, revolt of, 68 n. 3, 69, 74 sqq.; clan-relations, 84 sq.

Laish, 41.
Levites, and Eli, 36; David, 8; in Chronicles, 91, 98 n. 3; and the ark, 38; election, 72 n. 2, 73–8, 86 n. 1, 113 n. 2; relation to Mosaïte and other clans, 39, 78 n. 1, 85 sqq., 124 sq.; Levitical traditions, 89, 149 sq., 153.
Local traditions, significance of, 31, 149 sq.

Mahanaim and David, 4, 11, 14; and Ishbaal, 16, 131; distinct traditions, 93.
Mahaneh-Dan, 88.
Meribbaal, 14 sqq., 132.
Miriam, 72, 79 n. 1, 84, 86.
Moab in Davidic traditions, 93, 134 n. 2.
Moses, 36, 39, 69 sqq., 74 n. 1, 85 sq., 113 n. 2.
Muṣri, 8 n. 1, 64 n. 1, 95 n. 1, 123 sq.

Nadab and Abihu, 68, 76 sq.
Nahash, 4, 12, 23, 25.
Nazirites, 97.
Nob, 99 n. 1, 128 n. 2, 143.

Paran, 8, 68, 134.

Patriarchal narratives, 59, 106, 144–8.
Phicol, 95 n. 1.
Philistines, problems, 43 sq.; oppress Israel, 21 sqq., 53, 127, 131 sqq.; the ark, 36 sqq., 55 n. 2; in district of Shur, 65; replace older ethnics, 133 sq., 137, 144.
Phinehas, 85 n. 3, 95 n. 1.
Post-exilic history, 63, 104 n. 1; relation to older tradition, 57 sq., 67, 119. *See* Chronicles.
Prophets, guilds of, 35; traditions of, 115.

Rechabites, 29, 35 n. 1, 135 n. 1, 152 n. 2.
Rephaim, 133 n. 2.
Reuben, 58, 87.
Reuel, 84.

Samson, 34 n. 2, 48, 126.
Samuel, early youth, 27, 33 sq.; home, 52, 98 n. 3, 135 n. 1; relations with Saul, 22, 49 sq., 52 sq., 135, 142 sqq.
Saul, traditions of his rise, 19 sqq., 48, 53, 59, 96, 127 sq.; connexion with Benjamin, 29 sq., 42 sq., 50 sqq., 97; relations with David, 6, 30 sq., 128 sq., 140; conquests, 106 sq., 129 sqq.; growth of hostile tradition, 130, 132, 135 sq., 143 sq. See Jacob, Joshua.
Sheba, revolt of, 17, 41 n. 3, 110 n. 2.
Shiloh, 28, 36 sq., 42, 55, 97 sq., 99 n. 1, 127, 143.
Shimei, 15.
Shobi, 4, 12, 14.
Shur, 64 sq.
Simeon, 87 sqq., 148 n. 2.
Sinai, 66, 68, 70, 72 sqq., 78 sq., 107, 122, 124 n. 1.
Solomon, birth, 4; temple, 99, 108 n. 1, 138 n. 1; history, 138 sqq.
Spies from Kadesh, 69, 122, 134.

Taberah, 68.
Tribes, 95, 99, 102 n. 2, 147 sqq.

Yahweh-Nissi, 66 n. 2.
Yam Suph, 64, 80.

Zadok, 99.
Zerah (Cushite), 109.
Ziklag, 7, 89 sq., 129, 134.
Zuph, 52.

Oxford: Horace Hart, Printer to the University